

ceding that Sir Stafford might have used better terms, a Board of Trade spokesman was quite emphatic today in his assertion that an effort to read into the statement a subtle approach to new loan negotiations was mere misdirection of energy.

Britain still has an unused balance of more than \$3,000,000,000 under the United States credit. The real concern is not over the rate of exhaustion of credit, which has not so far been much in excess of original expectations—despite frequent assertions to the contrary—but over the fact that so much of the loan has been spent without resulting in any substantial improvement in the country's productive capacity. Britain has been using the loan just to keep up minimum imports, without getting either much new equipment or rebuilding her stocks of industrial raw materials.

In addition to the loss of exports as result of the industrial crisis of February, the yet unknown additional strain on imports resulting from flood damage to agriculture has made it likely that the rate of exhaustion of credits will increase.

It can be stated quite definitely, however, that a British request for a new loan is at present out of the question. While a few back-benchers of both major parties have raised the issue in Parliament, the Government is not now looking in that direction for a way out of the country's difficulties.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I believe this semiofficial denial may clear the air somewhat. Speaking merely as one Member of the Senate, I should like to state that I do not believe this body will be inclined to look favorably on a proposal for an additional loan to Great Britain. A number of Members of Congress expressed the opinion last year that a loan to Britain would not solve her problems, but that a more fundamental readjustment was necessary. If Britain should come to us with a request for another loan, I suspect that many more Members of Congress might come around to the thinking of those who opposed the loan last year.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I request that the proper officials of the Senate have placed on the desk of each Senator tomorrow a copy of the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I understand that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will discuss it tomorrow. I think it better to request that the report be placed before Senators in that way, rather than to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which would be a rather expensive way of getting the report before Senators. I think it clear that the report should be before us when we meet tomorrow.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite sure the majority leader the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would wish me to announce that it is planned that when the Senate meets tomorrow, the session will run into the night if a vote has not been had upon the question of confirmation of the nomination of

Mr. Lilienthal. So I desire to announce that it is planned that tomorrow the Senate will continue in session during the afternoon and into the night, without a recess at the dinner hour.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is also true, is it not, that the same program is contemplated for Thursday and Thursday night, if the Senate has not previously taken final action on the nominations?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; I thank the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee for that statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I spoke to the majority leader about the possibility of deciding today or tomorrow whether to ask the Senate to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote perhaps some time on Thursday on the nominations. I am not prepared to make such a request at this time, because very few Senators are now on the floor of the Senate. I had in mind having further discussion along that line with the majority leader tomorrow. I wish to give notice that such a request may be made some time tomorrow, so that Senators will at least be in a position to make up their minds about what they will do if such a request is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that of course such a request is always in order, but my opinion is that it will depend entirely on how we get along with the debate. Certainly there are many speeches yet to be made. I know that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] will speak, and I imagine he will speak at length, because we wish to hear from him. There are many other Senators whom I know will wish to speak. At any rate, we shall jump that hurdle when we reach it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska agree that if he hears from me at length, he will listen at length?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I will. I always am glad to listen to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. If I can convert one Senator, I shall be glad to speak at length, for that will be the first time I shall have had that experience since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, do I hold the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, when the Senate convenes, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until

tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. George Mayo, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Galilean Master, Thou who hast given to home and country all that can be given; who didst carry in Thy holy breast all the sacred aims which cannot die, bear witness of us that this day may be blessed.

We pray to open the way that leads to lofty altitudes of conscience and thus honor our high estate, fortifying our understanding with freedom from prejudice, from intolerance and bigotry. Quickened the sentiment of the public in deepest sympathy for all who suffer, that it may not fail in the performance of its whole duty for the welfare and protection of the people.

O that the spirit of our Master may bless and comfort those whose loved ones perished in the darkness of the bowels of the earth. Walk with them on the road to their earthly Emmaus, breaking the bread of eternal life.

"When sinks the soul, subdued by toil to slumber,

Its closing eye looks up to Thee in prayer.

Sweet the repose beneath Thy wings o'ershading,

But sweeter still to wake and find Thee there."

In Thy holy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the completion of the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. **BOGGS** of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Boggs of Delaware addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **PATTERSON** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. **CRAWFORD** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a brief summary of the various State laws dealing with communism.

Mr. **MEYER** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include an editorial from the Independence Reporter.

Mr. **SMITH** of Ohio (at the request of Mr. McGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include some letters.

Mr. **McGREGOR** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. **THOMAS** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and include a letter which I have just sent to the Attorney General, asking the Attorney General why he does not prosecute the Communist Party under the Voorhis-McCormack Act.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MITCHELL** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD**.

Mr. **AUCHINCLOSS** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include an editorial.

Mr. **JENISON** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. **MATHEWS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MATHEWS**. Mr. Speaker, I asked a man who operates a little gasoline station in a small town what he thought about the President's plan for Greece and Turkey. He said he was perfectly willing to extend some little help to

Greece but was absolutely opposed to sending any troops. He is also opposed to Congress appropriating large amounts to numberless foreign countries without some direct approval by the people.

He says that people are now asking him for credit for a couple of dollars' worth of gasoline, which they did not do before, and from his conversation with them he thinks they are losing their respect for their Government.

He says a man is not born "red," but becomes that way because of conditions, and that if we continue to give away everything we have and continue high prices for scarce goods in this country we will have a field in which communism can thrive.

EMERGENCY TEMPORARY DISPLACED PERSONS ADMISSION ACT

Mr. **STRATTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STRATTON**. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit admission to the United States of our fair share of displaced persons, provided they meet the standards under the immigration laws.

This bill seeks to give those unfortunate people, uprooted by war and unable to return home for fear of persecution, a chance to lead decent, useful lives as free men and women. At the same time, the bill would result in the saving of millions of dollars now spent in maintaining displaced persons' camps.

Offering these people opportunity would be totally in keeping with the tradition of our Nation which was founded by immigrants and always has profited by their contributions.

OPINION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF SENIOR CLASS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL AT SPARTA, WIS.

Mr. **STEVENSON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STEVENSON**. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased this morning to receive a letter from the senior class of the Sparta High School of Sparta, Wis., giving me their opinion and recommendations as to the proposed loans to Greece and Turkey.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include this letter as part of this statement.

I commend the members of the senior class of Sparta High School for writing their Congressman and giving him the benefit of their views. I wish all senior classes in the United States would write their Congressmen and let their Congressmen know their opinions on national issues. I welcome the useful and stimulating remarks of every senior in every high school on all matters before Congress.

SPARTA, WIS., March 27, 1947.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: After having put in some study on foreign relations, we have decided that the only way to have a firm American policy is to back up the one we state.

We are much in favor of President Truman's plan as put forth in his recent speech regarding aid to Greece and Turkey. We feel that unless immediate action is taken, the issue will die in committees. Too many times, the American people have threatened and not acted. We have seen the results of delayed action in the Nazis' attack on Europe, in the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the Japanese invasion of China.

It would seem that the American people have backed the President almost unanimously in his stand against the spread of totalitarian forms of government. Yet Congress does not seem willing to express the people's desire for immediate action.

We have told Russia where we stand; now let us show her that we mean what we say by carrying out, without delay, the policy we have stated. That would mean not quibbling about the methods by which it should be done but to get it done as quickly as possible.

Very respectfully yours,

The Senior Class, Sparta High School:

Phyllis Martin, Robert Munger, Wm. Ziegler, Shirley Petersen, Betty Knudtson, Beverly Hohn, Margaret Van Kirk, Basil Abbott, James Beron, Jesse McComb, William Hggzman, Mary Flood, Madge Morgan, Dora M. Olsen, S. Barrett, George Olson, Eleanor Paulson, Bob McCollough, David Sullivan, Lloyd W. Peters, Verna Schober, Carol Schild, Arvilla Van Dkye, Beverly Hannis, Beverly Waage, Byron Zimmerman, John R. Druyer, Robert Goodman, Jeanette Griffin, Betty Jane Guy, Carmen Hesselberg, Suzanne Johnson, Juantine Knouse, Viola Brockman, Rosemary Kness, DeLaus Mautzke, Jane Peterson, Dick Hubbell, Carlos Z. Cartilh, Dolores Bonin, Gloria Leenett, Dale Bennett, Lucille Andringa, Jerry Neumann, Doris Ninneman, Dolores Rasmussen, Connie Schauf, Bob Salmon, Charlotte Schlaver, Jack Shlimovitz, Alice Slaver, Joyce Swingle, Beverly Zimmerman, John L. Sullivan, Allen Stendal, Farrell D. Sousek, David Koss, Janet Erlandson, Jean Hanson, Rietk Christensen, Sue Hill, Margaret Willey, Margaret McCoy, G. Oakley, Dolores Ottum, Arnold Petersen, Mary Schmitz, Elizabeth Schroeder, Don Sutter, Carol Wilcox, Ronald Wettstein, Helen Lebbe, Donna Newbeng.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. **ELLIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Ellis addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **COUDERT** (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a message and report

of Adele I. Springer, the new president of the National Association of Women Lawyers.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by David Lawrence and also a report by Cecil Holland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION REDUCTIONS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, \$6,000,000,000. The question is, Where are you going to save the money?

We now have the answer, and the answer is by slashing appropriations for the veterans, by slashing appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, by crippling national defense, by understating our known obligations, and by refusing to pay our just debts and obligations.

Mr. Speaker, that is the program of the majority as I see it, and I am against it.

GOOD FRIDAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on the eve of Good Friday to call to the attention of the House H. R. 1981, a bill which I introduced several weeks ago. The purpose of this bill is to give Good Friday the same legal status as Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Armistice Day.

I am sure that if the Members of the House will read the hearings recently held by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, they will be impressed with the justification for making Good Friday a national holiday.

Since introducing this bill I have been receiving mail from all over the country commenting favorably upon the measure and expressing the hope that it will be enacted into law.

There has been a marked progressive increase in the observance of Good Friday in recent years in this country. Among Christian countries Good Friday is looked upon as a great holy day and one to be observed with appropriate reverence. The United States is the only large Christian country in which Good Friday is not a legal holiday. It has been made a legal holiday in the British Empire, the Baltic countries, Italy, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, and practically every other country. And in most of the countries where it is not a legal holiday it is religiously observed.

I am informed that approximately 15 States in our Union have, either by legislation or proclamation, established Good Friday as a holiday.

It is my hope and belief that if this bill is enacted into law in order to permit a more free and full religious observance of Good Friday, it would aid in the advancement of the fundamentals and ideals of Americanism and contribute to the resistance of ideologies foreign to our way of life.

I have been pleased at the general national interest that has followed the introduction of this measure and the support that it is receiving from the churches, service organizations, women's clubs, fraternal organizations, business and trade organizations, and civic groups.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the TVA appearing in last Sunday's Boston Herald.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the essential parts of a speech recently delivered by Father Edmund A. Walsh, regent of the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University, at Boston.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Country Gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the session of the House, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DORN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who just spoke a while ago with reference to what the Republican Party was trying to do which would be harmful to the veterans and public works. We Republicans are not trying to do anything at all that is harmful to the veterans. We want to assist them all we possibly can. I want to say that if the New Deal Democrats had not been so much of a spendthrift administration for the last 10 or 15 years, you would not have had a debt of \$259,185,335,159 on March 27. It is because you people have been squandering the money of the taxpayers of America that you have got this country in the terrible hole in which we find ourselves. A shocking debt. We are only trying to save this country for the veterans and for our people. We are trying to save this country for the American people, the thrifty people, the people who want to work and earn and save and protect America. That is what we want to do. We want to help these people, not harm them, and the Republican Party is going to stand up and do everything it can to preserve the institutions of America and make this country safe and solid for everybody for years to come. We believe in a sound, strong Government so we can have a good government for our people to live in, one that can protect and defend all our citizens by having a sound Treasury, a well-balanced economy, jobs for all, and happiness on every hand.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by Paul Mallon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the bill unanimously reported favorably by the Committee of Public Lands, of which I am chairman, to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, adopted March 28, 1947, and House Resolution No. 45, adopted March 26, 1947, by

the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by him at the University of North Carolina under the sponsorship of the Carolina Political Union, dealing with the President's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an address delivered by Rear Adm. O. L. Colclough at a convention of the Reserve officers of the naval services held in St. Louis last week end.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from Los Angeles papers.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks made by Daniel Webster 123 years ago on the subject of extending relief to Greece.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE GREEK FINANCIAL SITUATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank at the time that Premier Tsaldaris was in this country seeking a loan made a confidential report on the Greek financial situation. Why does the State Department refuse to make public this report of one of the agencies of our Government? And, Mr. Speaker, the UNRRA in February of this year, made a confidential report which the State Department also refuses to make public. Mr. Speaker, why is the State Department afraid to tell this Congress and the American people the truth about the financial foreign indebtedness of Greece, and why is the State Department afraid to tell the truth about the present Greek Government?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Department of State does not have confidence, in the common sense, of the Congress, or confidence, in the common sense, of the American people. The State Department seems to be infected with the idea that the truth is not a good thing. In fact, they seem to have procured an iron curtain from somewhere and they have decided to put an iron curtain around the truth about Greece and Turkey. I suggest that the State Department give us the truth, and they return that iron curtain of theirs to the place where it belongs. The American people do not like iron curtains, and our State Department, if it does not yet know that, ought to become

acquainted with the love that the American people hold for the simple plain truth about situations in which they are asked to take action. As an example of the kind of thing I mean, will our State Department please inform the Congress whether or not the Greek Minister of Security Zervos was a collaborator of the Nazis during the time of their occupation of Greece? Second, will our State Department please inform us why it is that over 1,500 officers who served in the Nazi security battalions during their occupation in Greece are today officers in the Greek Army. Mr. Speaker, we would like to know how many of the present ministers in the Greek Government were collaborators with the Nazis—we want to know! We have a right to know. We are being asked to support that Government with assistance of American taxpayers, and before we vote to pour that money down a rat hole, we want to know the truth about the present Greek Government—its financial commitments, its foreign indebtedness, the history of its cabinet ministers, and why it is that 1,500 officers in the Greek Army were Nazi security police.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to where we are going to make slashes in the Federal budget, I know a young man who is now working with the Army. After working 8 hours for the Government he works 8 hours in private employment. He says that out of 86 people in his department, 40 could be disposed of with resulting greater efficiency in that civilian branch of the Army. He says those conditions exist generally as to civilian employees in the Army and Navy. So we can cut the budget of the Army and Navy and help to meet the \$6,000,000,000 reduction in the budget and get greater efficiency. It is my opinion that there are no departments in the Government in greater need of being gone over with a fine-tooth comb by the Committee on Appropriations than the Army and the Navy. By so doing we will not impair national defense, but will increase it.

THE BRITISH PUNISH THE INNOCENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the British Palestine Government will require the entire Jewish community to pay for the damage of at least \$1,000,000 caused by fires of oil installations at Haifa. This damage was sabotage and is ascribed to terrorists. The British action is equivalent to visiting punishment upon the innocent. Responsible Jews in and out of Palestine deplore terrorism. I condemn it. Jews themselves have been hurt and killed by the unlawful action of members of the Stern and Irgun gangs. Certainly the entire Jewish community should not be made to pay for the crimes of a few desperadoes.

Attlee and Bevin fail to realize that the deliberate default of their solemn pledges to open the gates of Palestine to refugees has caused despair, and despair creates terrorism. But why hold innocent people as hostages and make them pay blood money? It makes a farce of British justice. It is like making the entire citizenry of Washington pay for the desperate action of a few of its citizens. That is unthinkable.

But British cruelty knows no bounds in Palestine. Our administration should offer vehement protest to the end that Great Britain will punish the guilty and not the innocent.

We are up to our necks in the middle east. Our Government can and should protest the latest campaign of British injustice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include three pages of a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

INTERNATIONAL MOON GAZERS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Members of the House of Representatives should not remain silent while a large number of international moon gazers, who seem to be floating around in a pink cloud of sublimar radiation, attempt to destroy the Government of the United States or make it subordinate to UN, which has been compared to an international Sanhedrin.

I am opposed, and I believe nine-tenths of the American people are opposed, to setting up any supergovernment over the United States.

These speeches that were made on yesterday, especially by Mr. "Corn" Wallace, former Secretary of Agriculture, and others I could mention, demanding that we subordinate this Government to this outfit in New York, this Tower of Babel if you please—that behind-the-scenes talk mostly about what they are going to get out of the United States or what they are going to do to us—do not

reflect the sentiments of the American people.

It is time for real Americans to wake up and say to the world that we are not going to destroy the United States or subordinate it to the will of an outfit dominated by Joe Stalin, Molotov, or Gromyko.

We have appeased those enemies of our country too long now.

We had better look out for our own country and our own people before it is too late.

Remember that—

No man escapes
When freedom fails,
The best men rot
In filthy jails;
And they who cried:
"Appease, appease,"
Are hanged by men
They tried to please.

Communist control of this country would mean the putting to death of probably millions of our people and the enslavement of tens of millions more. It would be the end of freedom of all kinds in this country.

It must not happen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, giving some information about the safety situation in the coal mines.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the front page of the New York Times on the Communist drive in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Abernethy	Chapman	Gorski
Allen, Ill.	Cheif	Grant, Ala.
Allen, La.	Clements	Hale
Andersen	Clippinger	Hall
H. Carl	Combs	Edwin Arthur
Andrews, Ala.	Cotton	Harless, Ariz.
Andrews, N. Y.	Coudert	Harness, Ind.
Barden	D'Alesandro	Hartley
Bates, Ky.	Dawson, Ill.	Heffernan
Bishop	Delaney	Hinsaw
Bland	Donohue	Hooven
Bonner	Doughton	Howell
Bradley, Calif.	Elliot	Huber
Bradley, Mich.	Elsasser	Hull
Bramblett	Fallon	Jenkins, Ohio
Brophy	Feighan	Jenkins, Pa.
Buchanan	Fletcher	Johnson, Tex.
Buckley	Fogarty	Karsten, Mo.
Burke	Fuller	Kean
Byrne, N. Y.	Gallagher	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Gavin	Keefe
Carson	Gerlach	Kelley
Chadwick	Gordon	Keogh

Kirwan	O'Brien	Simpson, Pa.
Klein	Pace	Smith, Wis.
Knutson	Passman	Somers
Larcade	Pfeifer	Taylor
Lyle	Philbin	Thomason
McMillan, S. C.	Plumley	Towe
Maloney	Potts	Vall
Mansfield, Tex.	Price, Fla.	Vinson
Meade, Ky.	Rains	Wadsworth
Meyer	Rayfield	Whitten
Mills	Rooney	Williams
Morgan	Sadlak	Winstead
Morrison	Sadowski	Woodruff
Murray, Wis.	Shafer	
Nodar	Sikes	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 167) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance, in the amount of \$50,000, providing protection against loss with respect to such funds. Until otherwise provided by law, premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the Sergeant at Arms and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 22, 1947:

H. R. 1968. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On March 27, 1947:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

On March 29, 1947:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On March 31, 1947:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard;

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of

title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2489, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Readjustment benefits: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Readjustment benefits," \$523,836,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 9, line 5, strike out the sum "\$523,836,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$873,836,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am restoring by this amendment, and the House will if it adopts the amendment, the \$350,000,000 cut which was made by the committee in connection with this matter. There was an item of \$624,000,000 which was expended to meet 1946 requirements, about which there was considerable confusion in the testimony and direct confusion in the main table that we considered on page 4 of the justification that General Bradley presented to us. We had General Bradley up after his representatives called our attention to it late yesterday. This question took place while the general was there:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You can see in this testimony that Mr. CASE refers to how apparently there was some trouble on the cut which we made, and there was apparently some misunderstanding, but that testimony certainly indicated that that cut was in order.

General BRADLEY. If I misled you there, I am sorry, because I was discussing the amount needed for the rest of the year. I also did not begin back and pick up this \$24,000,000 that we started short.

Now, that is the reason that cut was made. We were deceived by this page 4 of the justifications which we had before us when the General was before us and this did not show the \$624,000,000 expenditure, and although we made the most careful analysis that we could of the picture, we did not run into that testimony and these figures. I am sorry that the committee made that mistake, and I can see nothing else to do under the circumstances except to offer this amendment. I hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his strategy. He was wise enough to sense the temper of the House and its determination to increase the appropriation to the amount

requested by the Bureau. At this late date, in a deathbed repentance, it is proposed to restore the \$350,000,000 cut.

Something has been said about deception. If there was any deception it was self-deception, because this whole matter, including the expenditure of the \$624,908,509 in 1946, the first half of the fiscal year, is plainly set forth in the table on page 650 of the hearings. This table was before the committee at the time the bill was marked up—at the time it was determined to make this unwarranted cut in this important provision for the veterans. There could have been no mistake about it. It stood out like an elephant in a flower garden.

The table lists the total amount of money available for the year. The first question that naturally would have been asked—if they had not known already—would have been, "How much of it have you left at this time?" It is evident that the insistent fight made by the minority to restore this item, and the obvious support of the House on the floor yesterday during the debate on the amendment has not been without results.

To have passed the bill as it was submitted to the House yesterday without this \$350,000,000 would have been to deny the veterans benefits and advantages to which they are entitled under veteran's legislation enacted by the Congress by practically unanimous vote. I am glad the motion comes from that side, although we had the identical motion ready to offer from this side and the House was ready to pass it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me it is just a little unfortunate that the gentleman from Missouri was not present during a great deal of the hearings on this bill so that his committee might have had the benefit of his knowledge; also that the gentleman was not present at the time that this item in the bill was marked up. I am not criticizing the gentleman, for the gentleman's many duties may have called him elsewhere, and I can add that it was not my privilege to be present during a great deal of the testimony of General Bradley because the Committee on War Appropriations was meeting at the same time, and I was there much of the time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed; then if I have time I shall be glad to yield. The hearings, of course, are available to everyone.

Let me call your attention to the following statements made during the testimony of General Bradley and appearing at page 638. The chairman asked General Bradley how much money had been spent month by month. They went over the various months, and the Chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. In January a little under \$90,000,000; with \$15,000,000 it would be \$105,000,000. If you call it \$110,000,000, you would be getting to pretty near a stable average; would you not? It ought not to run over \$110,000,000.

General BRADLEY. Under present conditions that ought to be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. On that basis \$550,000,000 ought to take care of the last 5 months, which would make about \$1,505,000,000 for the year. This was 7 months. The first 6 months was \$955,000,000. So that \$550,000,000 would cover your requirements for the way the thing looks now.

Mr. MOORE. That would be that one particular phase.

Mr. Moore was the finance officer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking you about.

General BRADLEY. We think that will. You see the figures I gave you a minute ago on which the estimates were based were made up last fall, and we anticipated about 1,250,000 average, and now we are getting only about 1,150,000.

In other words, last fall, when they made up their deficiency estimates, they estimated they would have a million and a quarter veterans getting the readjustment allowances. Now it is running about 1,150,000 as an average. So, taking the figures which General Bradley had given and running them back to him and asking him if \$550,000,000 would be sufficient for the balance of the year, the chairman was entitled to think, on General Bradley's replies, that the amount suggested would cover the requirements. That is, the \$1,505,000,000 on which the committee's figures were predicated.

In the same way, during the testimony on the estimates the chairman asked General Bradley about the funds required for Army and Navy pensions based upon the monthly expenditure experience. And in the same way General Bradley answered him on that, and said it looked like they could do with \$241,000,000 instead of \$441,000,000. In other words on Army and Navy pensions General Bradley said that a cut of \$200,000,000 could be made. He reiterated that this morning and the figures on that saving will not be changed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that both in the subcommittee and in the full committee Republicans and Democrats alike were unanimous on both these matters?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And is it not a further fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] at no time prior to the time the bill came on the floor indicated that the cuts as made were not properly made?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is a fact. The action of the committee so far as anyone knew was unanimous, and if the gentleman had some other information the committee did not get the benefit of it. In any event, the figures that were presented by the committee were on the basis of the testimony that I have cited, and General Bradley this morning expressed his regrets that his replies had unintentionally misled the committee.

In addition to that, it should be pointed out that the general table at page 4 of the estimates showing the amount of funds that had been appropriated for 1947 gave a larger amount than was needed to meet 12 months' expenditures at the rate of actual expenditures. The explanation is that actually some of these

funds which were listed as appropriated for 1947 were used in 1946 fiscal year.

In fact, \$624,000,000 was spent before June 30, 1946, which explains the misunderstanding that developed. There is even a definite possibility that the amount of the budget estimate being provided by the chairman's amendment will not meet the requirements. In that case, we hope that an additional deficiency estimate may be considered before the end of the fiscal year so we can get on an even keel and start the new fiscal year with a clean slate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Missouri and my friend who has just spoken, I am glad that this matter has been taken care of in the way it will be in a few minutes; however, the action to be taken shows the constructive import of a minority party in this body. The Democratic Party, as I have said on several occasions, the role of our party, is as a constructive critic, a constructive proposer and a constructive opposer. In other words, the role of a minority party under constitutional government is one of constructiveness and the Democratic Party in the House yesterday under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] as well as others, who spoke yesterday on this bill, lived up to the highest ideals of that role, in calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that a very serious mistake had been made in the sum of \$350,000,000, a matter of grave import to the veterans of this country. I congratulate the gentlemen on my side for their constructive leadership of yesterday which was brought about, I am sure, mainly as the result of the leadership of the minority party in taking the action that will be taken today and in the action taken by the leadership of the majority party, and I want to express to them my congratulations for recognizing the power, the force and the logic of the constructive criticism and the constructive suggestions made only yesterday by the leaders of the Democratic Party in connection with this bill, bringing back into the bill \$350,000,000, which means so much and will mean so much between now and June 30 to the veterans of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

GEN. OMAR BRADLEY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to restore this appropriation, but I rise at this time to deplore the unjust

criticism that is being heaped on General Bradley.

I saw the same thing done to General Hines 2 years ago. I served in this House as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation in the minority, for many years and 8 years while General Hines was head of the Veterans' Administration. I never knew a more conscientious public servant in my life than Frank Hines. Two years ago an investigation was stirred up and some writers poured into the RECORD statements that when run down were found to be made by inmates of insane institutions.

It embarrassed the Administration and General Hines resigned and became Ambassador to Panama. Now, the same type of attacks are being made on General Bradley, one of the great heroes of the war through which we have just passed.

When General Bradley became head of the Veterans' Administration he came before our committee. I said, "Now, General, remember you have only been through a war up to this time. It may look like a sewing circle by the time you get through with this job."

I am not saying that everything that is done by the Veterans' Administration is perfect, but suppose you keep on until you drive General Bradley from that position, just whom will you put in his place? Why disturb an institution that is doing so much for the servicemen of this Nation by continuously nagging that great soldier, that great American, who is now head of the Veterans' Administration?

I just wanted to utter these few words of protest and say to you that General Bradley has one of the hardest jobs that ever fell to the lot of an individual any time, anywhere. It is one of the biggest jobs in the world, and the less criticism, unjust criticism, that is hurled at him, the better he will be enabled to discharge the duties of that exalted office.

For my part I say that General Bradley is doing a splendid job. Let's help him and not hinder him in the discharge of his duties as head of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military and naval insurance: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Military and naval insurance," \$3,125,500, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would not burden the RECORD with a personal reference but for the fact that reference repeatedly has been made by the gentleman who has just spoken to my absence from the committee.

It is a matter of common knowledge in the committee that I was a member of two subcommittees meeting simultaneously, devoting part time to each committee, and in addition was a victim of the flu a considerable part of the time the two committees were in session. For

that reason I was unable to attend the meeting of the committee when the bill was reported and certainly would not have agreed to the item had I been present. I was, however, present when the bill was marked up in the subcommittee and offered numerous suggestions, but not a single suggestion I made was given the slightest attention. So the statement made that it was unanimous is not sustained by the record.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, maybe the coolness with which the gentleman was received was what gave him the flu.

Mr. CANNON. The warm friendship of all members of the subcommittee more than made up for the official chilliness accorded my humble suggestions.

But we must not get away from the one proposition, Mr. Chairman, that an attempt has been made here to deprive the veterans of \$350,000,000 without which we could not have carried out the provisions of the GI law. The proponents of the cut planned to cut that much money from the bill and drafted the bill with that in mind and wrote the report and brought it in here on the floor. Only our determined opposition to the cut here on the floor yesterday—and the obvious support accorded us from both sides of the aisle—brought about the change which they propose this morning. They marched up the hill. They saw the situation. And they promptly marched down again.

Now, the only alibi offered is that they did not know about this \$624,000,000 spent in the first half of the fiscal year. It was like a headlight on a locomotive at midnight. It could not have been overlooked. It is here in the table on page 650 of the hearings. They had this table before them in print when they marked up the bill. All of that has been said here—all the citations of colloquy with General Bradley cannot conceal the fact that they made this cut of \$350,000,000 with their eyes open. Any other version would be a sad reflection on the ability and alertness of the large number of experienced men at the majority end of the table who made a searching cross-examination of all witnesses who testified on behalf of the Veterans' Bureau. Any suggestion that they did not know that any part of the money for the fiscal year had been spent in the first half of the year constitutes one of the most transparent alibis ever offered on this floor.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I must offer condign criticism against the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the failure to include moneys for payment of judgments obtained in the Court of Claims and approved by the Supreme Court, approximately \$2,000 for the salaries for past services rendered by Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., formerly members of the Communications Commission staff, and Robert Morss Lovett, former Government counsel of the Virgin Islands. The Supreme Court held that the action of the last Congress in depriving these men of their salaries was a bill of attainder. We now thumb our nose at the Supreme

Court and still refuse those salaries to those three gentlemen, although that Court said our previous action was illegal. Thus we continue an illegality and refuse to admit our error.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for many years and as a student of the excesses growing out of the actions of the French Chamber of Deputies in passing bills of attainder during the Reign of Terror, I think the Committee on Appropriations was woefully in error when it previously deleted these salaries, and this Congress was woefully in error in adopting the views of the Committee on Appropriations. Now the Committee on Appropriations repeats its sin by deleting the salary of one Warren of the Conciliation Service and by still refusing justice and earned salaries—now reduced to judgments against the United States—to Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett.

Let me read you briefly from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against Lovett:

What is involved here is a congressional proscription of Lovett, Watson, and Dodd, prohibiting their ever holding a Government job. Were this case to be not justiciable, congressional action, aimed at three named individuals, which stigmatized their reputation and seriously impaired their chance to earn a living, could never be challenged in any court. Our Constitution did not contemplate such a result. To quote Alexander Hamilton, "A limited Constitution . . . [is] one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority; such, for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex post facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of the courts of justice; whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing."

We will again be flying in the face of the principle enunciated by Alexander Hamilton if we follow the lead of the Committee on Appropriations and agree to cut out the salary of this man Warren. To my mind, this action is small; it is petty. Not much money is involved, but a very bad practice is involved, as is a very bad precedent, a precedent that may well come back to plague us in the future. If we can cut off the salary of Warren, then we can cut off the salary of an Ambassador, a Federal judge, a Cabinet officer, the President himself. Such action destroys the separation of powers theory of our Government. Cutting out salary is tantamount to dismissal—an executive act.

This is the first time I know of that an appropriations committee has recommended that a debt sanctified by a decision of the Supreme Court shall not be paid.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In connection with that, may I say to the gentleman that in the case of Dalton against the United States in 1930 the Committee on Appropriations refused to pay a judgment of \$11,900. That came up several times, and an amendment was offered on the floor in

several subsequent years, and it was refused.

Mr. CELLER. I am not familiar with that instance. I am not informed of the court that rendered the judgment. I probably should be. I probably am delinquent in not recalling that incident. I do not recall whether the judgment was rendered by a State or Federal court. But I know it is repugnant to the Nation's conscience to repudiate a debt. A debt was incurred when these men rendered services and when Mr. Warren rendered services. After the services were rendered and a debt has been incurred, by an ex post facto enactment you cut off that salary, you repudiate that debt.

Mr. TABER. I presume the gentleman is familiar with the provisions of the Constitution that no money shall be authorized to be paid out of the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I am well aware, of course, that the powers of appropriation reside in the legislative branch, but in the exercise of those powers the legislature cannot poach on the preserves of the judicial or executive branches and the legislature cannot indulge in what I might say in common parlance is lynch law, to condemn a man or woman without trial and without confrontation of witnesses and without an opportunity to be heard to defend themselves. That is what we do in the case of Warren if we delete his salary. That is what we did in the case of the three gentlemen I mentioned—Messrs. Dodd, Lovett, and Godwin Watson. We simply said in effect, "You men are guilty," because somebody somewhere said that they were associated with certain subversive organizations, but they had no chance to defend themselves and confront their accuser before this body—the body that sought to judge them. We acted as prosecutor and judge and jury. We have no such procedure here to permit them to exculpate themselves, to defend themselves. We simply point a finger of guilt at them and we say, "You are guilty, and you must be taken off the payrolls."

I want to say I do not harbor any sympathies for these men, if they are subversive. I may not agree with their political ideologies. If they are Communists, I want them taken off the payroll, but there are other methods by which we can take them off the payroll—legal ways. We seek to dismiss them in an illegal way. Only the executive can discharge them. We have no such rights.

The President of the United States in his wisdom recently announced a procedure to determine an employee's loyalty and we should follow that procedure, but we should not, as I said be-

fore, develop a kangaroo court here and make of justice a travesty by our action.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. If the founding fathers had expected that the Congress would exercise its power to appropriate funds in any other way than by an exercise of its discretion and the merits of each item that came up, a provision would have been inserted making the payment of judgments of this character automatic.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking now of the Warren case, and this is what the Supreme Court says.

Mr. TABER. I am talking about what is before us.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking about the Warren case. We cannot exercise the power of appropriation by passing what I called before ex post facto statutes or bills of attainder. Here is what the Supreme Court said:

Those who wrote our Constitution well knew the danger inherent in special legislative acts which take away life, liberty, or property, of particular named persons because the legislature thinks they are guilty of conduct which deserves punishment. They intended to safeguard the people of this country from punishment without trial by duly constituted courts. When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishment were too dangerous to liberty to exist in a nation of free men and vision, and so they proscribed bills of attainder.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. In order to correct the RECORD, the gentleman stated that Dodd and Watson had no hearings and were not confronted by witnesses.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that, sir. I did not say that. I said there were no hearings before us where we constitute ourselves as a court and strip them of their rights and privileges. A hearing before a legislative committee is not a judicial hearing, hearing where there is accorded the right of counsel, the right to be confronted with the accusers, the right of cross-examination, the right of direct examination under proper rules of procedure, with no admission of hearsay and self-serving declarations. That is what is meant when we speak of judicial hearing.

Mr. MASON. Hearings were held before the committee of this Congress and full testimony was taken.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with that, but that is not a court. That is not a procedure outlined by our Constitution whereby the condemned secures a fair trial before his rights of property or salary are taken from him. The accused are deprived of their rights under the Constitution if we do not accord them a trial where they can adequately defend themselves and have counsel and cross-examine and confront hostile witnesses. A hearing before a legislative committee is insufficient to ground the claim to deprive a man of his property or his security or his life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to my good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER]

lamenting the actions of the Appropriations Committee, I think I ought to say a word in the way of commiseration of the committee in view of all the pressure that is being exercised at the present time. To me it is an astonishing spectacle that pressure of the most highly organized type is becoming so rife in the country today with respect to the actions of the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives in respect of appropriations for the Federal Government.

One of the latest editions of my very fine collection—and I assure you I am getting a collection from all over the country—is a letter sent out by the National Customs Service Association, dated the 27th of March 1947, and signed by one J. F. Doyle, the president of the association. It is a very interesting document, and I think the House and the country ought to know a little something about it.

It starts out in the first paragraph by saying:

In anticipation of favorable action by the Senate on the customs budget—

You see under the rule one should not mention the deliberations of another body, but already they are anticipating favorable action from another body. They are anticipating that the money will be restored. They are anticipating, of course, that they are going to roll back the well-deliberated action of the House of Representatives and the subcommittee that spent weeks and weeks in exploring these matters.

They say further:

This letter is being distributed so as to put you all on your toes.

Get ready, boys, for one grand offensive upon the Congress of the United States that is charged under the Constitution as the guardian of the purse and the taxpayer's money. So get on your toes now for a grand assault upon the Public Treasury.

They say further:

We must all be ready to get going.

Be ready in all corners of the country now, not only to retain your spot on the pay roll but to get additional spots on the pay roll.

This letter goes on:

Contact particularly the House Subcommittee on Appropriations.

And then it mentions the names. They forget about the antilobbying statute, and perhaps it needs a little doctoring up. It is deficient in the sense that you have to use public funds to carry on this lobbying work. The time has come when we are going to have to give serious consideration to this business of these people who are entrenched on the pay rolls of the country pressuring Congress to put back money that should have been taken out long ago.

So, "Contact members of the subcommittee and then contact other members of the Appropriations Committee," and it names them.

Then, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] it says, "Write particularly to Congressman TABER." You see, he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Write par-

ticularly to him. Address your missives and your telegrams to him, and put the bee on JOHN TABER, who has been fighting the battle of economy for a quarter of a century for the people of this country in this Congress. JOHN TABER, who has been on the Appropriations Committee since 1923, has done a magnificent job for the country. So, boys, put on the pressure now and see if you cannot weaken him, now that he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Then they have this further very significant thing. Now, listen, if you have any doubts about these telegrams coming from home:

Granting of the \$36,000,000 as approved by the Budget Bureau for personnel will allow the retention of all employees and the addition of 600 new employees.

The subcommittee was correct. They wanted to put on 600 more and we said, "No." So full steam ahead now. Put the pressure on Congress and on all Members and get some favorable response from them. That is the kind of propaganda that is going out by the ton at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of it has been inspired here in Washington.

Now, I will read a little more from this very edifying document:

Have your letters and telegrams ready. Have your contacts made.

If anybody has got any influence now, have him call his Congressman. Have him send telegrams, have him send letters, find out who your Congressman is. Maybe none of these boys have had contact with him before, but find out now, because maybe your job is in jeopardy, but be sure and contact your Congressman. Maybe he had not shown up in other days and other years, but contact your Congressman now and find out who he is.

Do not miss any chance to convince your Congressman that he should act favorably.

Lay it on the line now. Tell every Member of the House and of the Senate that you demand favorable action to put this money back, including money for 600 over and above those who are on the pay roll at the present time. They are not satisfied with that kind of pressure. They go on to say:

Letters and telegrams from home are needed.

Circulate around in your neighborhood, find out somebody who knows the Congressman, and get them to send in letters and telegrams.

Petitions also will help. Circulate one in your own division or room.

Throughout the customs service they are urging that they send petitions to Congress to break down their resistance

in the interest of the taxpayers of the country so that more people can be added to the Federal pay roll.

Contact newspapers.

Now you know why all these articles have been appearing in the country press, and in the daily press. The boys are busy, they are giving a good account of themselves. I saw an article in the New Hampshire paper which says this, if it is put into effect, will result in dope smugglers running wild all over the country. And so the pressure is on. They are getting the word out to the country newspapers:

Contact chambers of commerce and business houses. Contact veterans. Contact railroads and steamships. Contact politicians.

That is great. Contact politicians and have them give Congress the business. Maybe there is a State legislator or a State senator out home; maybe there is a chief of police or a sheriff who is elected to public office; anybody, any elected official, any politician, get him to write in and tell the Congress how serious it is that the Senate ought to put back this money and the House ought to go along.

Contact your governor, the mayors of every city, all State and city officials, and everyone or anyone who can help.

Yes, they are getting ready to go out and put the pressure on Congress. They have got to get that "dough" back into their bill because there are 600 additional jobs that probably will be available in the 1948 election. So full steam ahead, boys, get everybody from the governor on down, the chamber of commerce, your neighbors; put the pressure on those humble Representatives in Washington, make them put back the "dough." The sanctity of the Federal pay roll must not be profaned by those profane Representatives of the people on Capitol Hill who are trying to scare up an occasional dollar for the great forgotten man in America, John Q. Taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress, and as a lawyer, I say the Supreme Court has a good deal of repenting to do before it will ever direct me how to legislate, especially after the Bridges case. Besides, it is not the prerogative of the Supreme Court to tell the Congress what to do. The Constitution vests that power in us.

I voted to eliminate these men from the pay roll before and I am going to vote so again.

To show you the kind of propaganda they are spreading all over the country they will be coming in here and demanding that the Supreme Court put back these men that President Truman is getting ready to throw off the pay roll.

I have here an advertisement that appeared in both big New York newspapers, an advertisement by the Communist Party, and to show you how they are going to concentrate on others I want to read this for the edification of the gentle-

man from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It states:

Act now.

To outlaw the Communist Party is to scrap the Bill of Rights.

That is a criminal party or organization engaged in a criminal conspiracy to overthrow this Government, a criminal plan for spreading poisonous propaganda for the purpose of destroying American institutions. There is a bill now pending before the Committee on Un-American Activities, a successor to the same committee before which these people had their hearing, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] was on the committee at that time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. They were convicted upon their own testimony?

Mr. RANKIN. That was my understanding.

Mr. MASON. By words from their own mouths?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. Now, they come back here, after the Supreme Court has made a first-class citizen out of Harry Bridges, and try to have the Supreme Court tell us how to legislate.

This Communist advertisement goes on and states:

Protest this effort.

Telegraph or write to (1) President Harry S. Truman, White House, Washington, D. C.

They ask these people to write to President Truman, as if he does not have enough mail on this subject already.

Who is the next one they want the people to write to? Listen to this:

(2) Representative RANKIN, House Un-American Committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

Just imagine the message in garbled English that will come to my desk as a result of this appeal.

They ask them to write to President Truman and to write to me.

Who is the third one?

(3) Your own Congressman.

That is, after they find out who he is, I presume.

No; this element that is attempting to browbeat Congress into keeping men on the Federal pay roll who are found to be unfit and unworthy has brought about a great deal of the trouble that we are having today. It has brought about the necessity for President Truman's issuing his Executive order recently to drive from the Federal pay roll those people who are subservient to a foreign power and who are working for the destruction of this Government.

Let us be men, let us vote our own convictions, and let the Supreme Court know that the Congress of the United States will do its own legislating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Operating expenses," \$38,220.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 11, line 6, strike out "\$38,220" and insert in lieu thereof "\$63,700."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. We are glad to see the bill improved.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I personally am responsible for the amount stated in the bill, and I personally want to be responsible for restoring this amount. It is for the conducting of our recreational facilities here in the District, and it is made necessary by action of this House in raising the wages of the people employed in those recreational facilities. I think it is mighty important that they be kept going at their present status.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' SERVICES

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], this question, while it is fresh in my mind and before I forget it, if it is true, according to newspaper reports, that you have ordered the discontinuance of construction of veterans' hospitals in this country?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. I have no authority to do anything of that kind. I have tried, insofar as I have been able, to persuade the Veterans' Administration to take over and operate hospitals that the Army and the Navy are using or have been using, which they are ready to surrender, so that they might have some place to take care of these boys temporarily, and I have also urged that the Veterans' Administration use the 3,000 beds that they were supposed to use in the Navy hospitals that are being operated by the Navy, so that they might be better able to take care of the boys who need hospitalization.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also ask the distinguished gentleman this question: How could the plan operate without sufficient money? We also have inadequate staffs.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about sufficient money being available to the Veterans' Administration for those hospital operations.

Mr. DORN. I understand that in a lot of places right now, in addition to the 23,000 men who are on the waiting list, we have lack of funds to provide for adequate staffs to take care of some of those we do have.

Mr. TABER. Whether there is or not, that matter has never been presented to our committee. Frankly, from the best

computation that I was able to make, I felt that for salaries and expenses the chief of the Veterans' Administration had a margin of about \$25,000,000 for the balance of this fiscal year. Be that as it may, if an estimate were presented to us for our consideration, or if any facts were brought out which justified our going into anything of that kind, we would have hearings upon it and go the limit in trying to provide.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that the American Legion has quite a few facts on men that are on the waiting list for hospitalization, men of both wars, and also inadequate staffs in certain sections, and also that 14,000 beds of the Army and the Navy, civilian and State hospitals, are already being used right now.

Mr. TABER. Well, the gentleman may be right. Instead of using about 5,500 Navy beds they have dropped down to using 2,500 beds. That is the picture as far as utilization of Navy beds goes. I have felt that they should take advantage of their opportunity to use the Navy beds that are available to them. Maybe I am wrong in trying to get them to do that, but I felt it would relieve the pressure on the bed situation.

Mr. DORN. Did or did not the gentleman ask them to suspend construction? That is the report. Whether or not it is erroneous I do not know, so I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I did not ask them to suspend construction, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since we are speaking of the beds for the veterans' hospitals, I should like to bring to the attention of the House a thing that has alarmed me very much, and that is General Eisenhower's reported statement that there should be one head over the Army and Navy and Veterans' Administration hospitals. I believe the Members of the House would agree with me that the veterans want to be hospitalized, in the main, in their own veterans' hospitals under their own veterans' physicians. The entire membership of the House will want to look into that situation with me and see that the Army and Navy do not take away that service. My understanding is that neither General Kirk nor Admiral Swanson want to consolidate the service. I believe that the veterans would not get as satisfactory care if that were done. There are many things that veterans require that are not so easily adjusted if they are hospitalized in Army or Navy hospitals. That is just one reason for not consolidating them.

Under the GI bill of rights we authorized the appropriation of \$500,000,000 for the construction of hospital beds, so there can be no question of there not being enough money to go ahead with hospital construction. We have all been greatly distressed that for one reason or another the construction of veterans' hospitals has not gone forward during the past 2 years. To me it seems inexcusable.

I should like to say to the House, in view of the fact that it has been stated quite often that General Bradley resents surveys or inspections or investigations, that as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have the opinion, in which I think the other members of the committee will all back me up, that General Bradley not only does not resent our survey of his installations but rather welcomes our suggestions. I saw General Bradley this morning, and I am under the impression that he is very glad of any work done by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its staff insofar as the curtailment of \$350,000,000 in this appropriation for veterans is concerned. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] acted promptly to reinstate the appropriation after the real need was shown for the appropriation at this time. I think it was work done by our Veterans' Affairs Committee or related to it that was somewhat responsible for the Veterans' Administration correcting the mistake in the figures they gave to the Committee on Appropriations so that the figures were finally agreed to. The employee of the Veterans' Administration who gave erroneous information is no longer doing that kind of work. That is an instance of the Veterans' Administration wishing to correct any situation that is not helpful. The task of caring for over 20,000,000 veterans is a staggering task. Cooperation is necessary if we are to be successful.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am just wondering whether the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs can advise us whether or not that committee is in agreement with the policy, as I understand it, of General Bradley with respect to having the veterans' hospitals wherever possible at medical centers and large points of population where they will be easily accessible to the veterans. Is the committee in agreement with General Bradley on that policy?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, as chairman, I cannot speak for the entire membership of the committee. We have 21 new members on the committee now, and the chairman does not know the views of all the members. I do think the committee would agree entirely that it is important to have hospitals where the most expert medical advice is available. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly stated that hospitals should be made accessible to the veterans. General Bradley and General Hawley deserve an enormous amount of credit for the fine medical and nursing service they are giving the veterans, the very fine outside consultants that are being used, and the outside clinics that make more beds available in the hospitals, outside clinics which, because they are available, allow the men to continue their work, since they can go to the clinics and still continue on their jobs.

In this bill is a ceiling of 100 persons in the Public Relations Division of the Veterans' Administration. I am of the

opinion that the other body will modify that cut in personnel. I should like to point out certain functions that Division performs:

The increase in staff of VA public relations was made by General Bradley because the previous Appropriations Committee established a ceiling of 300 people for this operation and specifically recommended that the then existing staff in this operation be built up in order that more and better information might be disseminated to veterans and their dependents as to their rights and benefits and how and where to obtain them. It was felt by the previous Appropriations Committee that an organized, nationwide effort of this sort would accomplish two things:

(a) Render a service to which veterans are entitled.

(b) Ease the ever increasing burden of letters, inquiries, misdirected claims, applications and complaints pouring into Veterans' Administration.

There is considerable evidence that VA public relations has more than paid its way in accomplishing those results. VA radio programs alone have done an effective job of disseminating information to veterans.

The figures on VA radio programs are interesting:

During the first 7 months of fiscal 1947 VA spent \$92,212 on radio salaries and \$17,609 on records. That is a total of \$109,820.

The programs those salaries and records created were aired by radio networks and stations throughout the country to the tune of \$5,170,899 worth of radio time for which VA paid nothing!

I want a complete analysis of the functions and effectiveness of this activity before too drastic cuts are made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a few minutes ago, appeared to be very, very much disturbed over a letter that the president of the Customs Employees' Association had sent out. After 16 years of being on the majority side in the House and knowing what the results are of people exercising their constitutional right of petition—and that is all that this gentleman was doing—I would suggest to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that he view these experiences from a more tolerant angle because what Mr. Doyle did—I think that was the gentleman's name—was under a constitutional right which he, as well as every other American citizen, possesses to petition their public officials. Whether or not he did it in a way that pleases my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not the question. I think what he did is all right.

I remember in past years receiving many letters from the National Association of Manufacturers. I did not take the floor and accuse them of pressure of any kind. I received those letters recognizing the fact that whether or not I agreed with them that organization had a constitutional right to communicate with me.

It is only recently that the wool interests in my section of the country—and

I do not know that any of them are Democrats up my way, but I do know many of them whom I personally like—contacted me. They are businessmen. They have contacted me through the years, and I hope they will continue to do so as long as I am a Member of this body. I never considered they were doing anything other than exercising their right as American citizens to petition their public officials.

I have in mind the fight now between certain Western States and western interests and New England on the question of export of leather and hides. I have taken the position which I think is for the best interests of New England. I do not consider they are doing anything terrible or engaging in any sinister act in communicating with me. I consider they were doing so in the exercise of their constitutional right of petition.

However, Mr. Doyle's letter did certainly produce great results. In exercising his right as a humble American citizen, he has started into operation something that apparently disturbs greatly my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In any event, it has brought to the country the fact that the appropriations for the next year for the Customs Service, unless increased, will seriously affect that service which the agency will be able to give to the business interests of America.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, on page 1367, I inserted a letter which I received from Commissioner Johnson which fairly sets forth the situation showing why they have had to lay the men off. In the deficiency appropriations carried in this bill, some slight relief will be afforded between now and June 30, but it will not meet the situation that will exist after June 30 because in the appropriation bills we have passed heretofore relating to the Treasury Department there is a provision, so far as terminal leave or annual leave pay is concerned, that it is to be paid out of 1947 appropriations and not out of 1948. The committee and the House by that action tapped into the 1947 appropriation in relation to separations, that ordinarily would have taken place on or after July 1.

But my main purpose in rising is to call to the attention of my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] impersonally and in the most friendly and warm spirit, the fact that for 16 years we Democrats have received those communications on this side and we have considered it the constitutional right of citizens to petition their public officials. The letter that was sent out by the president of the Customs Association was one that he had a perfect right to send out. In doing so he is exercising his right as an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COURTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member and I am beginning to learn that matters are not always debated where they appear on the agenda. I believe it would

not be fitting if some member did not visit on this side of the aisle to call attention to the failure to give full faith and credit to a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. As a lawyer I am shocked by the proposal before us to deny such full faith and credit to a judgment of the Supreme Court. The separation of the powers between the Judiciary, the Executive and the Congress is basic in our constitutional Government, we have found it the surest check on tyranny. There may be a tyranny of Congress just as there may be a tyranny of the Judiciary or the Executive. I do not want such tyranny nor, do I believe, does any clear-thinking Member of this House. For today the objection may be that the three men in question are fellow travelers I do not quarrel with that; tomorrow, it may be United States citizens of German, Polish, Italian or Russian extraction; it may be Catholics or Jews or it may be Negroes. Once respect for the coordinate branches of Government breaks down, there is no end to the mischief which can be done. No democracy can survive without self-discipline. I can sympathize with the feelings of the gentlemen of the Deficiency Subcommittee, when they speak of the odor relative to these cases, and I can appreciate the feelings of these and other members who believe sincerely that they have suffered here for years under the tyranny of a Chief Executive; but the people gave us a mandate not to substitute a new tyranny but to do away with the old. I believe we must honor these judgments of the Supreme Court.

I hope and pray that in the same spirit of public interest that some changes have already been made in this bill today, and on the basis of sustaining the coordinate branches of Government as we ourselves wish them to be sustained, the Deficiency Subcommittee may again consider this matter, small in money and yet very great in principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public assistance and children's services: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Public assistance and children's services," \$155,200.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee to clear up some misconceptions that apparently exist with regard to the availability of funds. It is important that these items that have just been read be made available as of March 1. Is it the understanding of the chairman that is possible.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that this language as it reads would make funds available for the whole of the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. HORAN. Then there is no question as to their availability at any time in the fiscal year 1947?

Mr. TABER. Within the limits of the law which authorizes their distribution.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 15, after line 21, insert the following:

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946, \$6,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

The statute which purports to authorize it provides as follows:

Such payments to any State in any fiscal year during the period 1947 to 1950, inclusive, shall be made upon condition that each dollar thereof will be matched during such year by \$1 from sources within the State determined by the Secretary to have been expended in connection with the school-lunch program under this act.

For the purpose of determining whether the matching requirements of this section and section 10, respectively, have been met, the reasonable value of donated services, supplies, facilities, and equipment as certified, respectively, by the State educational agency and in case of schools receiving funds pursuant to section 10, by such schools.

The total appropriation distributed amounts to \$72,975,000; the total matching complete \$11,470,000.

There has been complete failure of matching by local authorities within the provisions of the statute. Under the circumstances they have not complied with the law and there is no opportunity for a deficiency here.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment indicates, the appropriation proposed here is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. The act speaks for itself. Under the law the question of matching is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is not a matter to be determined by this body. That is a function specifically delegated by the act to the executive in charge of the program—the Secretary of Agriculture. There is no question about the amendment being in order. The sole proposition involved is to carry out the provisions of the act. I submit that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is germane to the bill and the appropriation authorized by law; therefore overrules the point of order presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that the shoemaker's children are without shoes. That is the situation before us in this bill today.

The bill carries \$300,000,000 for food for foreign countries. Under the provisions of the bill we provide money to feed children all over Europe. Out of this \$300,000,000 America pays to feed the children of every race, kindred, and tongue, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, the learned and the unlearned, the washed and the unwashed, from Kamchatka to Karahissar. Foreign children are provided for but there is nothing in this bill for the children at home. The shoemaker's children are without shoes. American children are without food.

The evidence adduced when the authorizing legislation for the school-lunch program was before the House showed an appalling number of children in every metropolitan center in the United States who went to school without breakfast.

Mr. Chairman, the efficacy of the school-lunch program, and its universal need throughout the country, is demonstrated in a vivid and convincing manner in the reports from the draft boards in the recent war. Vast numbers of young men were disqualified by the draft boards and rejected for Army service because of disabilities directly due to lack of an adequate diet in the period of adolescence.

This program is now in operation in schools in every congressional district in the Union, and it is the practically universal testimony of teachers and parents that in schools in which the program has been adopted and noon lunches are being served, there has been a notable increase in the weight and health of the child, and simultaneously there has been a corresponding increase in scholarship. A hungry child lacks the power of concentration and study. An ill-nourished child does not learn as readily.

And results are not confined to the schoolroom or to the school life of the child. They are reflected in the training and ability, the body and mind of the adult. There is nothing this House can do that will contribute more directly to the physique and mentality of the next generation than the support of this appropriation to effectuate the National School Lunch Act passed by such an overwhelming majority in both Houses in the last Congress.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Is it not a fact that we have appropriated money to care for the cattle of our country, yet we neglect our children?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. We have just made an appropriation of \$9,000,000 to control diseases of livestock in Mexico. Now we are asked to refuse an appropriation of \$6,000,000 to ameliorate malnutrition of American children in every State of the Union.

One of the things President Hoover particularly emphasized when he was before the committee was that unless European children are fed now the next generation will be dwarfed and stunted for life. You can starve an adult and there will be no ill effects if proper food is provided in time. But if a growing child is starved, the child is permanently injured both mentally and physically,

regardless of the food eventually provided. Children deprived too long of proper nourishment never attain in later life full growth and stamina or the highest degree of mental alertness. European children must be fed now. And for the same reason American children must be fed during school years. Will you deny them that priceless heritage by refusing to add this small amount to the pending bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this school-lunch proposition comes here without any hearings before the committee, without any estimate from the President, without any approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and let me say to you that the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget refused to make an estimate.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to remind the gentleman that I asked for permission to come before the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of this deficiency item, for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. After the hearings had all been closed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. At the first opportunity I could come, I asked.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is this Congress going to let the Bureau of the Budget legislate for it?

Mr. TABER. No; but you know the Bureau of the Budget is the President's representatives, and I thought that you folks might be interested in knowing what the executive branch of the Government thinks of it.

Now, I want to give you the picture just as I see it. Seventy-five million dollars has been appropriated already. The total funds to match this appropriation that have been made by States and local governments run \$11,470,400 and those were the figures submitted by the Agriculture Department to the Bureau of the Budget.

Let me say to you that the children do not get free lunches. According to the amounts that were paid toward these lunches, the children paid \$127,000,000. Of the amount that was allotted by the Agriculture Department upwards of \$6,000,000 was for distribution. Well, if these things were operated right in the localities, they would be taken care of for less money. Now, the Federal Government is right on the verge of bankruptcy. Most of our State and local governments are in good condition. Many of them have surpluses. There has been no local matching that was at all satisfactory. The matching in New York State was the highest in proportion. There it was \$2,500,000 against Federal expenditures of something like \$4,400,000, and the statute requires that this matching be dollar for dollar, which it very evidently is not. Illinois comes next among

those that matched, and there, as against about \$3,100,000 they matched \$858,000. But no single State has matched according to the law. If they had matched according to the law, instead of the \$75,000,000 being used, there would be a very large surplus at this time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. What the gentleman says may be right, but does that relieve us of our responsibility to provide hungry children throughout the Nation with something which they need at a time when they need it?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide children with these lunches. I think the locality should do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Where the State has failed to supply the necessary funds, they have been supplied from other local sources.

Mr. TABER. No; they have not. They have not been supplied at all. The payment for the lunches is in no possible way a compliance with the law. The law has been violated the way this money has been distributed. These States and localities have utterly failed to meet their responsibilities if they are going to continue with this operation.

Another thing I want everyone to consider is that if this bill is passed by the 1st of May, that is about as good as we can expect, and it is impossible for anything of this kind to begin to operate on a deficiency basis at that time. There would be no excuse for any money being appropriated here even if there had been a legal and valid operation of this proposition. It is time the Federal Government begins to balance its budget and that we cease to raid the Federal Treasury for every single item that is needed for the operation of schools or anything else in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from New York has made the assertion in opposition to this amendment that there was no estimate from the President or no approval by the Bureau of the Budget. What the gentleman says is correct. However, we are doing the legislating, and on past occasions this House has acted independently of any recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget. I will concede that as the general rule and the general practice an estimate from the Budget is sought, and it is generally followed, and the appropriations are generally reduced where there are reductions, but it does not necessarily

follow that there are no exceptions made. In my years here I have many times seen estimates increased, and I have seen money appropriated where authorized by law where there was no estimate, where the Committee on Appropriations included it in a particular appropriation bill. I call the attention of my colleagues to the occasion of only a few days ago when the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill passed the House. There was a budget estimate and a Presidential recommendation for \$50,000,000 for hospital construction to carry out for the next fiscal year the provisions of the bill we passed last year. In its wisdom, and I agree with the wisdom of the subcommittee and the full committee, the committee struck out the \$50,000,000 recommended in the President's budget but included a provision permitting the agency administering the law, the United States Public Health Service or the Office of Education, the right and power to make contract obligations in the sum of \$150,000,000 during the fiscal year 1948. There was therefore no Budget recommendation for this. I think the committee acted wisely, and I approved of the action and made that approval manifest.

In the same bill there was an increase in the appropriation for cancer research. I think the appropriation of \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 was increased to \$19,000,000.

Again, I wholeheartedly approve of that. I think there were one or two other appropriations or items in the bill where there was an increase. So I think that is a complete answer to my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], whose main argument is that there is no estimate.

The House has inserted items in bills before where there was no estimate, and so has the committee.

We must also keep in mind that my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] a few weeks ago, in answer to a question that I asked of him, frankly admitted that he personally is opposed to the school-lunch program. One thing about the gentleman—when he gives an answer, he always gives a frank answer. Of course, we have to keep in mind in interpreting his state of mind with reference to the remarks he made today is that he is personally opposed to the school-lunch program.

It seems to me that this has been a very fine program. It is now permanent law. We made it permanent law last year. No matter what the original intent of Congress was in making the appropriations in connecting it up with surpluses on the farm, that has been changed by act of Congress and we have passed permanent authorizing legislation. Therefore, we consider it in all of its aspects to be a wise policy for our Government to follow.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman from New York in his remarks in defense of this cutting of the school-lunch program said the Federal Government was on the verge of bankruptcy.

May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York: Does he

believe then that this is the time for us to cut taxes and reduce the revenue of the Federal Government?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I do not. The distinguished gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from New York is sincere in his position, but his main argument today is not a precedent for this House to follow. We have repeatedly in this House put in items in a bill where there was no estimate. The Committee on Appropriations has also done so. We did so, as I said, in the labor and security appropriation bill just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the good judgment and integrity of my good friend from New York, but I do not subscribe to the doctrine of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. If I economize, and I am for economy, I will never economize at the expense of a hungry child.

I have taught school back in the mountains of my native east Tennessee and in the coal-mining camps. I have seen children come to school who did not have enough food at home or enough food in the little lunch baskets that they brought with them. In many instances they did not have enough food to properly nourish them.

If we appropriate this \$6,000,000 to supplement the school-lunch program, it will cost each and every person in this country the stupendous sum of 4 mills. If there is any Member of this House who feels that he or she cannot afford to invest 4 mills in the minds and bodies and souls and welfare of the school children of this country, while I am not a wealthy man, I will reimburse him or her the 4 mills that he or she is out as the result of the adoption of this amendment.

Abraham Lincoln said that a nation may be said to consist of its people, its territories, and its laws. The vital and determinative feature of a nation's life and existence, its whole future, lies in the growth and development of our boys and girls. They are the seed corn of the Nation. I know that the people of Tennessee are complying with their part of this program which the Federal Government held out to them in the law of the land, establishing the school-lunch program. Thousands of devoted women in Tennessee are canning hundreds of thousands of cans of fruit and vegetables each year that are used in preparing these lunches for the school children. We will be asked in a few days to appropriate \$400,000,000 to start with, in undertaking to take care of Greece and Turkey. Well, if we are to undertake to take care of Greece and Turkey and the other countries of the world, we must first take care of America. These boys and girls are our first line of defense. They are the hope and pride and strength of the Nation. They are the power of the people unto the salvation of the State. They will meet our enemies in the gates.

I recall that during the First World War, one of the ablest physicians and surgeons that I ever knew in all my life, Dr. James L. Heffernan, of Jellico, who was on the board of medical examiners who examined the manhood of Campbell County, my home county, for military service, referred to the fact that the men of Great Britain were so undernourished that only a small percentage of the manpower of that country was fit for military duty. He said that in his examination of the men from Campbell County he had to turn down less than 1 percent. They had been properly nourished. Great, vigorous, broad-shouldered, muscular men who were unafraid, and capable of being built into a living wall of offense and defense for their country's victory in that war.

Mr. Chairman, let us not pinch a penny or skim around the brink until we fall into perdition. Let us vote this 4 mills per capita, and my proposition will be made good to any man in this House. If he wants his 4 mills back, I will refund it to him; if he wants it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when in 1933 and 1934 food was rotting on our farms, to relieve the situation and bring about a fair distribution of the tremendous surpluses, we provided an appropriation for a school-lunch program through which a great deal of the food that was going to waste was utilized by the children of our country. At that time nearly all of you gentlemen representing the rural districts and agricultural districts supported this proposition. But, unfortunately, of late you seem to forget that that appropriation was passed to aid you and to help the children of the poor. You do not need that aid now, because the prices that are being received for milk and other farm products are so favorable that this legislation really is not necessary at this time. But the children need these school lunches more than ever.

Does not the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] remember that in the last session the Congress passed the National School Lunch Act, which set forth a declaration of policy and authorized such appropriations for each fiscal year as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act? I quote sections 2 and 3 of the act, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 3. For each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, there

is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") to carry out the provisions of this act.

I concede that we have many school districts like those in the district of the gentleman from New York, populated by well-to-do people, who can and do provide nourishing lunches for their children, but even in those districts there are families who, due to misfortune, illnesses, or disability of the wage earner, can ill afford to pay the complete cost of these nourishing lunches.

Mr. Chairman, I observe the bill before us carries a provision for an appropriation of \$300,000,000 to feed people in Germany, Austria, and Japan, and, in fact, the committee increased the appropriation provided for Germany and Austria by \$28,000,000. But, to the minds of some, it is not necessary for us to provide for the continuation of a worth-while school-lunch program that will give proper nourishment to our own children to keep them strong in body and health.

I also notice that the committee has increased the appropriations for "Grants to States" by \$2,600,000, as well as providing for an additional appropriation of \$20,000,000 for crop insurance, yet it would deny insurance for the most valuable crop—namely, 10,000,000 school children who will be denied school lunches if provision is not made therefor.

Many letters, telegrams, and resolutions are received by me daily urging my support of a deficiency appropriation to provide for the carrying out of the school-lunch program for the remaining months of the fiscal year. I would insert some of them in the RECORD except that I will have one insertion to make in my remarks and do not wish to unduly encumber the RECORD. However, I want to say that there has not been a single appropriation proposed since I have been a Member of this Congress which has been for a more humane and deserving purpose than the one for this school-lunch program. I was hopeful that the gentleman from Missouri would offer an amendment providing at least an additional \$10,000,000 in order that the program might fully continue.

I appreciate that had it not been for the higher price of food and milk and the increased number of schools who subscribed for participation in the program, the original appropriation would have been sufficient. With the cost of food having increased by nearly 60 percent it consequently follows that this additional appropriation of several million dollars is necessary for the schools to continue to furnish luncheons for these needy children, many of whom without this balanced and nourishing sustenance would actually be hungry.

Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago you read about the terrible mine disaster in my State, outside of Centralia, Ill., where 111 miners lost their lives. Most of these men wrote letters to their loved ones while dying, and it was their urgent plea that their children should be pro-

tected and provided for. I read only a few excerpts from some of the letters:

Goodbye ——— and ———: God bless you and two boys, your father and ———. Please do as your father has told you and listen to Mom.

(Addressed to two boys): Be good boys. Please your father. O Lord help me.

Tell Dad to quit the mine, and take care of Mom, not like this.

Dear Wife: Please take care of the children.

Dear Wife: Goodbye. Forgive me. Take care of all the children.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposing this additional appropriation to continue school lunches, if adopted, will help some of these children, will relieve some of the widows and mothers of these children in saving them from hunger. If only the children of those miners who died will obtain their school lunches, it will be money well spent. Not only will it be a great blessing and benefit to them, but to the 10,000,000 other school children in our country. Provide proper nourishment for the child and you have given it the best basis to make a successful life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. My time is limited and I have only a few moments remaining. I regret I cannot yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist on his motion until we have had some debate.

Mr. TABER. We have had long debate and three times as much on the affirmative side as on the negative.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) were were—ayes 82, noes 72.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 85.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. Does that motion mean that the gentleman who has already been recognized has all of the time, or does it mean 10 additional minutes to the 10 that have already been allocated to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the motion to close debate in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all who desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, every State in the Union is in better financial condition to provide school lunches than is the Federal Government.

Apparently hearts do not bleed for the lunch program back in the States. All the bleeding hearts are here in Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is nothing so important pending before Congress at the present time as the request for additional funds to extend the free school-lunch program. The taxpayers of this country, I am certain, will all agree with me that we should first take care of our undernourished children at home before trying to feed the undernourished children of the world.

We have appropriated funds for the relief of practically every country in the world during the past 6 years and there is no sound reason why we should not appropriate sufficient funds to continue the school-lunch program. It is my sincere opinion that the school-lunch program is one of the finest pieces of legislation ever enacted during the Democratic administration. It has proven highly satisfactory to the children and to the farmers who have surplus farm products. There is no sound reason why additional funds should not be appropriated at this time to continue the school-lunch program.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the opposition to the continuance of the school-lunch program. The issue is very simple. You are either for the school-lunch program or against it. If you are for it you will vote for the amendment; if you are against that program you will vote to defeat the amendment. I am for it and I rise to support the amendment.

I fail to follow the reasoning of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee. He urges that this program should be a local one; that the States should pay the cost of it and that they are better able to do it than the Federal Government; that they have substantial surpluses, and yet in the next breath he criticizes the States for not matching the contributions of the Fed-

eral Government as the program contemplates. I ask how can we ever expect the States to pay all of the cost of school lunches when the gentleman admits they will not even pay their one-half share. The answer is simple. If we do not pass this amendment and depend upon the States to carry the load we will have no school-lunch program at all. We all want to feed hungry school children. Then let us do it and not indulge in specious arguments with the object of defeating this worthy, necessary, and humanitarian project. I must repeat: If we want to feed hungry school children, we must vote for this amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely shocking that the Republican Party has cut from the budget the money to help feed the school children of America. This is something that should be passed without partisan politics, but since Republicans have now exalted dollars and cents above flesh and blood let the full blame fall on you members of that party. Do Republicans feel that a solvent fiscal America is more important than a solvent physical America? I charge you with playing political football with American children. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] quoted his facts. Let me give facts of human life.

The National Research Council states:

Every nutritional survey in the past decade has revealed diets below standard in the United States.

In New York City 48 percent of low-income families had an average daily caloric intake below the minimum requirement. Seventy-four percent of the high-school students studied in New York City had substandard diets.

A survey of low-income families in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse showed 27 percent had diets below minimum standards.

An examination of school children in Texas revealed that 20 percent were so anemic as to require medical attention; 50 percent could not meet the Red Cross standards for blood donors.

Families of wage earners and clerical workers in 43 industrial centers showed only 21 percent had good diets; only 11 percent of the colored families had good diets.

A survey in 66 counties scattered over the country showed only 35 percent of farm families in the North and West, and 27 percent in the South, had adequate diets.

Another survey of 140 villages and 20 small cities across the Nation revealed that fewer than one-fifth had diets meeting the standards of the National Research Council.

In a Maine study of school children, only one child in seven got the minimum standard of one good vitamin C food daily.

Of over 3,000 women college students in the North Central States, 68 percent had diets deficient in at least one essential element.

In Minnesota, more than one-half of the children studied had poor diets; only one-tenth had good diets; children were encouraged to study food values and the school-lunch program was started; in 1 year poor diets dropped to 26 percent and good diets increased to 28 percent.

Fourteen percent of 15,000 volunteer blood donors were rejected by the one Red Cross unit in Chicago because of nutritional anemia.

A survey of 1,000 families in Louisiana showed less than 1 percent had diets that could be called good.

Diets of 7,000 children studied in Chicago showed 72 failed to meet the minimum standards.

Seventy-nine percent of children 1 to 12 years of age in a survey in Tennessee were found not to be receiving proper nourishment.

A survey of a group of Vermont school children showed 85 percent had evidence of rickets; one in four had spongy gums due to a lack of vitamin C.

In a North Carolina survey, 24 percent of the children had swollen gums; after only 6 days of feeding them canned grapefruit juice, 84 percent showed definite improvement.

Other studies in Maryland, California, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, etc., all tell the same story. In an experiment in England, a group of school boys was divided and half of them were given an extra pint of milk a day; after 1 year it was found that those not receiving extra milk gained an average of 3.85 pounds and 1.84 inches; those who got the milk gained 6.98 pounds and 2.63 inches. This experiment was then extended to hundreds of thousands of school children and the official report states that it unquestionably improved "the children's well-being, zest, and mental alertness." Similar gains in growth, better physical development, improved health and increased mental alertness as a result of school lunches have been widely observed where the school-lunch program has been in operation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the school-lunch program is one of the finest things ever undertaken by our Government. It is a real investment in the future of America. It is an investment in our children. The number of young men rejected for military service for physical reasons in the last war is itself sufficient proof of the need for this program. In all too many cases these rejections could be traced directly to inadequate diets. While, therefore, we are preparing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to feed starving populations abroad, it seems to me we should also make this relatively small contribution to the health and well-being of our own American children. I strongly urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the omission of an appropriation for the school-lunch program in this bill submitted by the majority is indefensible. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the ranking Democratic member of the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for \$6,000,000 although I am in accord with the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that he had hoped the amendment might be \$10,000,000.

To my colleagues on the Republican side let me say that we have fed the children of the world for the past many years—why not continue to feed the undernourished children of our own country? I take it that shortly this Congress will approve a \$400,000,000 loan to Greece to aid among others the children of that stricken country. Why not, my Republican colleagues, think now of the children suffering from malnutrition in our own country? Perhaps within a short time our largess will be extended to

Korea—why not indeed extend the largess of our Government now to the underprivileged and undernourished children in the substandard areas of our own municipalities, or to similar children in the rural areas of our country.

We speak of the spread of communism throughout the country and we are disturbed at its spread. Communism thrives on hunger and distress; it thrives especially where the victims of hunger are children and where their plaintive cries for food drive their parents to desperation. The adoption of this amendment will not only be a boon to the undernourished children of America, but it will be a direct and affirmative act against the spread of that ideology which preys upon the distress of people.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the appeal Spokesmen for Children, Inc., for a Government appropriation necessary to continue and extend the national school-lunch program, I wish to include a résumé of the facts and figures of nutrition surveys which have been reported by the National Research Council, the United States Public Health Service, and other medical and scientific groups, as follows:

The National Research Council states, "Every nutritional survey in the past decade has revealed diets below standard in the United States."

In New York City 48 percent of low-income families had an average daily caloric intake below the minimum requirement, 74 percent of the high-school students studied in New York City had a substandard diet.

A survey of low-income families in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse, showed 27 percent had diets below minimum standards.

An examination of school children in Texas revealed that 20 percent were so anemic as to require medical attention; 50 percent could not meet the Red Cross standards for blood donors.

Families of wage earners and clerical workers in 43 industrial centers showed only 21 percent had good diets; only 11 percent of the colored families had good diets.

A survey in 66 counties scattered over the country showed only 35 percent of farm families in the North and West and 27 percent in the South had adequate diets.

Another survey of 140 villages and 20 small cities across the Nation revealed that fewer than one-fifth had diets meeting the standards of the National Research Council.

In a Maine study of school children only one child in seven got the minimum standard of one good vitamin C food daily.

Of over 3,000 women college students in the North Central States, 66 percent had diets deficient in at least one essential element.

In Minnesota, more than one-half of the children studied had poor diets; only one-tenth had good diets; children were encouraged to study food values and the school-lunch program was started; in 1 year poor diets dropped to 26 percent and good diets increased to 28 percent.

Fourteen percent of 15,000 volunteer blood donors were rejected by the one Red Cross unit in Chicago because of nutritional anemia.

A survey of 1,000 families in Louisiana showed less than 1 percent had diets that could be called good.

Diets of 7,000 children studied in Chicago showed 72 percent failed to meet minimum standards.

Seventy-nine percent of children 1 to 12 years of age in a survey in Tennessee were found not to be receiving proper nourishment.

A survey of a group of Vermont school children showed 85 percent had evidence of rickets; one in four had spongy gums due to a lack of vitamin C; in a North Carolina survey, 24 percent of the children had swollen gums; after only 6 days of feeding them canned grapefruit juice, 84 percent showed definite improvement. Other studies in Maryland, California, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, etc., all tell the same story.

In an experiment in England, a group of school boys was divided and half of them were given an extra pint of milk a day; after 1 year it was found that those not receiving extra milk gained an average of 3.85 pounds and 1.84 inches; those who got the milk gained 6.98 pounds and 2.63 inches. This experiment was then extended to hundreds of thousands of school children and the official report states that it unquestionably improved "the children's well-being, zest and mental alertness." Similar gains in growth, better physical development, improved health and increased mental alertness as a result of school lunches have been widely observed where the school-lunch program has been in operation.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained during the quorum call earlier this afternoon but I am glad to be able to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the appropriation of sufficient funds to continue the school-lunch program to the end of the current fiscal year. I hope the amendment will pass because in my opinion the school-lunch program is one of the soundest investments we have ever made. One of our greatest assets is the youth of our Nation. To keep them well and healthy will insure a stronger and better America. I am going to support the amendment and I hope that it will be adopted. We have heard a great many speeches in recent weeks about the health of the young men and women of our Nation. The statistics of rejections from the military service is appalling. Here is an opportunity to continue a program that will go far in raising the standards of health of our school children. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the continuation of the school-lunch program until the end of the present school year, June 30. As a staunch supporter of this worthy program I am hopeful that this House today will forget partisan politics and that there will be enough Members on the left side of the aisle joining with us on the Democratic side to carry this amendment.

Economy is a good thing. Any sensible person favors it. I know I do. But some measures offered in the name of economy very often in reality are not for the best interest of our country.

In this case, scrapping of the school-lunch program may be termed expensive economy. Congress some time ago—in the days which the gentlemen to my left like to refer to as the period of the New Deal—authorized the school-lunch program by passage of permanent legislation. Now a new Congress, under Republican leadership, seeks to kill the program by withholding funds. If we fail to accept this amendment this afternoon

the actual program will be dead, yet the statute books will still carry authorization for the program.

I know the argument will be raised that this should be a function of the community and the States. The communities in many instances already participate. In no instance does the Federal Government bear the entire load.

From the past experiences we know the majority of States will not be able to support the program. True, State treasuries are filled with funds at the present time but as Governor Green of Illinois has pointed out most of these funds are earmarked for normal State functions which had to be put aside during the war years. As they are taken up once again, the State treasuries will quickly feel the drain.

The Illinois State superintendent of public instruction, Hon. Vernon L. Nickell, has urged the Illinois delegation in the House to support the school-lunch program. Mr. Nickell advises both State and Federal funds are needed in Illinois to carry on an adequate program.

Practically every school district in the State of Illinois favors this program. Teachers by the score have written to me—telling me of the wonderful accomplishments of the program and pleading for my support to continue the good work being done.

At Collinsville when the funds were exhausted the cost of school lunches immediately doubled. That will be the story everywhere. The result will be that thousands of children will suffer.

At Alton the school system was enthused over the school-lunch program and when it was written into permanent legislation the board looked into the future foreseeing the great benefits it would bring.

"During the past year our board of education has spent over \$10,000 of its building funds for the improvement of our school cafeterias, and we have planned for more expansion next year." Mr. P. L. Ewing, superintendent, wrote to me. The Alton board did this because it felt it had some assurance that the Federal and State school-lunch program would be carried out.

If we fail to act favorably today we will be letting down many school boards like the Alton board. More than that we will be taking the chance of injuring the health of thousands of school children. If you do not believe this latter statement just review the record of the program.

Most of us can remember when a child's lunch consisted of a hot-dog sandwich, a coke and a piece of pie or perhaps a scoop of mashed potatoes. Do we want to return to that? The school-lunch program taught children to select adequate meals and it developed in them a desire to do so.

Teachers can tell you how successful this program has been in this regard. Teachers also know that without Federal help most children cannot afford to buy the lunch previously provided. Purchase of milk under present prices would be almost prohibitive.

In 1941 a survey showed that 75 percent of school children failed to meet a standard even lower than that recommended

by the National Research Council. In 1946, principally because of the school-lunch program, a survey revealed a 25-percent improvement.

We can avoid a future recurrence of the 40-percent draft rejections of World War II due to nutritional deficiencies if this percentage of improvement is allowed to continue at this rate.

It is generally conceded by principals, teachers, and lunchroom workers, and parents alike, that the student partaking of a hot plate lunch daily, improved immeasurably in scholastic and athletic ability. They say there is less absenteeism and more attention at classes.

This problem affects the health, progress, and security of our Nation—and for these reasons I shall continue my support of the school-lunch program by voting for this amendment, and I sincerely hope it carries.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and endorse all that he has said so well.

It is difficult to understand the philosophy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAHER]. Apparently he believes that the children of our Nation should be penalized because of the failure of the States to match the funds of the Federal Government. I do not know if or why the States have neglected to do so, and I am not the least bit interested in that phase of the debate. I am interested in providing sufficient funds to continue this program of providing lunches for needy school children. Juggling of figures has never appealed to me, nor have I the ability to do a good job in this respect, but there are men in this House who have a great gift for that sort of thing.

I would like to see the school-lunch program strengthened and extended. The money spent will bring great dividends to our Nation in the form of healthier children today and more efficient citizens tomorrow. In a survey I made 36 years ago in several public schools I found that most stupid children were found to be the victims of poor nutrition. Following this survey a group of women, of which I was one, became interested in this problem; we cooperated with the teachers who had called our attention to the situation and provided milk for these undernourished children, and in a very short time thereafter a decided change was noticed in their mental attitude. Thirty-six years ago few communities realized the tremendous importance of nutrition in its relation to mental attitudes, particularly in growing children. Now we have at long last attempted to correct this waste of human energy, but we have not gone nearly far enough. We are conscious of the need of children of other lands and are making some provision to better their condition, and I am all for that, but why a Republican majority should dare to deprive the children of our own country of a paltry \$6,000,000 to provide school lunches for needy children is something completely beyond my comprehension.

I sincerely hope in voting on this amendment politics will be put aside and that we shall vote for the amendment in

the name of humanity and better American children for America.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have said before, and I wish to reiterate today, that it is poor economy indeed to try to save taxpayers money at the expense of such a worthy and necessary project as the school-lunch program.

In yesterday's debate the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] very ably explained the necessity of continuing and maintaining the school-lunch program. It is difficult to conceive of any justification for the termination of the program which has meant so much to the health and well-being of our children and Nation.

Many of the school-lunch projects throughout the country are now being discontinued simply because this body has not appropriated the funds necessary to carry on the project and furnish the lunches which are so vitally needed by thousands of our growing children. To many school children, Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this program will mean the difference between health and sickness, the difference between malnutrition or sufficient food to properly sustain the youngsters of our fair land.

Mr. Jesse B. Gilmer, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, has recently advised me that at least 32 States would face deficiencies in the school-lunch program if a deficiency appropriation were not made to tide the program over until the end of the school year.

Included in the 32 States is my own State of South Carolina, which will have a deficiency of several hundred thousand dollars. Some little money may be covered from the few States which will have a surplus, but that amount would be far less than the sum needed to carry the 32 States over until the end of the school year.

Mr. Chairman, in refusing to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program over, the Congress is scuttling one of the most progressive pieces of legislation passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In effect it is wiping out a public law which was passed to establish a permanent program for the benefit of our Nation as a whole.

No other program sponsored by the Federal Government has met with more wholehearted approval by the people of the Nation, and no program has had less criticism. The amount of money involved is insignificant in proportion to the benefits derived from the school-lunch program.

The money spent for this program is an investment in health, happiness, and national security. If we are to be strong as a Nation our children must be healthy; they must be assured of the nutritious foods they require. It is a fact that many school children who are the beneficiaries of the fine program would not otherwise have sufficient food properly to keep them in sound health of body and mind.

During the 1945-46 school term this program served more than 4,500,000 children, and in this year's program it has been estimated that more than 7,000,000 have been served.

I for one, Mr. Chairman, do not want to be guilty of depriving a single child of the food that he needs. But I know that if we fall in our responsibility to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program on, many thousands of children will be deprived.

I am convinced it will be a grave mistake if we allow this national school lunch program to go by default.

WE MUST FEED OUR OWN

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if we deny the underprivileged school children of this Nation an opportunity to be assured of at least one balanced meal during the school day, it will be as pathetic as tragic—pathetic on our part to look into the future and tragic to those who cannot provide for themselves.

In this Nation there are countless thousands of undernourished and underfed little children grasping for the light of education.

In this country there are many thousands of families who know nothing about providing their school children with adequate and balanced diets. From the mountains to the seas, there are families who must have our help on this matter.

We have recently loaned the British government \$4,000,000,000.

We are now contemplating making a loan to both Greece and Turkey to feed their undernourished. Can we be remiss if we provide for our own?

I do not care what course the Republicans may follow in this matter, but as for me, I am for the future men and women who will carry on long after we have perished into forgotten dust.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the majority membership of the Appropriations Committee has decided to make a small saving in appropriations at the expense of the health and welfare of our greatest asset—our American children.

Our Government has spent billions to fight a war for liberty and we should not now refuse to spend a comparatively small sum to protect the health of young America who will be our country's leaders in another generation. The Federal Government spends millions on soil conservation and it is money well spent because it guarantees to the future abundant food and prosperity. We spend millions each year on conservation of our natural resources so they will last down through the years to serve our people and this is also money well spent. We spend millions each year conserving the health of our livestock, treating cattle for hoof-and-mouth disease, hogs for cholera, and more millions developing food to make cattle and hogs put on weight, cows to give more milk, chickens to lay more eggs, and so forth. I am not opposed to the above expenditures, but the majority membership of the Appropriations Committee of this Congress should not deny to our children a small percentage of the money spent for care of animals and soil. We want our American children to grow and develop physically and mentally into real American men and women, strong in mind and body so they will be capable of carrying

on and preserving our God-given institutions of freedom, liberty, and equality. I know the fathers and mothers of America are for the school-lunch program.

The school-lunch program is not a new idea. Progressive, far-seeing men and women, church groups and parent-teacher associations in many sections of our country years ago realized the need of a child for a hot, nutritious school lunch and in a great number of instances the above groups provided school lunches on their own initiative.

I am satisfied that the Members of Congress, when they give solemn and serious thought to the necessity of providing hot school lunches for millions of underfed children that they will gladly appropriate these necessary funds. Let us protect and aid our greatest asset, the foundation of our country, our American children.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to provide \$6,000,000 for the school-lunch program. We are appropriating by this very bill before us today \$300,000,000 for aid to our stricken brothers across the sea. I am happy to support that program. I believe the American people are back of it, but I find myself unable on the same day I am taking that action, to deny to the children in our schools the benefits which I know they have derived from this program.

My attention has been called again and again to cases where children from the lower income families have gone to school without any breakfast at all. They cannot do their work. They cannot become useful citizens in our community, or any other community, on empty stomachs. It is, in my opinion, false economy in this bill, which provides total appropriations of almost \$2,500,000,000, to deny this comparatively modest sum for a worthy project.

I yield to no one in my desire and sincere intention to cast my vote in favor of the reduction in governmental expenditures. I voted to reduce the President's inflated budget by \$6,000,000,000. I have already withstood repeatedly the assaults of various pressure groups who have sought to get my assistance in restoring cuts in their budgets which have been made with prudence and sincerity by the Appropriations Committee. I shall continue to follow that course.

Furthermore, I am an opponent of Federal interference with the conduct of our schools. I think they should be under a control closer to the grass roots. I shall welcome the time when the school-lunch program can be taken over in its entirety by the localities. That will benefit the State which I have the honor to represent, since they pay more than any other to the support of this and all other Federal programs.

Until that time comes, however, I do not believe the people of my district want to see the school children go hungry, as I have been informed will happen in many instances unless this amendment passes. Certain it is, at least, that my conscience will not permit me to cast a vote which will effect such a result.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I shall support the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, for the life of me I cannot understand the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the leadership on the other side of the aisle in opposing this amendment, which seeks to appropriate the comparatively small sum of \$6,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. How can they justify their approval of the item in this same bill of \$300,000,000 to the War Department, as urged by former President Hoover, for government and relief in occupied areas all over the world, and their refusal at the same time of \$6,000,000 for undernourished American school children? They cannot; that is why they used their majority to shut off debate as they did, denying the privilege of the floor to a dozen or more Democratic Members who sought to speak for 5 minutes in behalf of this meritorious amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During the current year 130 schools in the State of Wyoming participated in the school-lunch program. An average of 12,500 lunches were served each day. Under the act of the last Congress Wyoming has been given a total allocation of \$109,421.59, of which amount \$18,000 was earmarked for the purchase of equipment, leaving a trifle over \$90,000 to reimburse all school-lunch programs in our State. The increase in the cost of food, cost of labor, and other expenses has resulted in exhaustion of the funds for this purpose some time back. I was extremely sorry to learn that the Bureau of the Budget had not approved an item in the deficiency bill for the school-lunch program. I think that was a mistake.

I am not certain that the appropriation of \$6,000,000 will be adequate to provide funds sufficient to continue the Wyoming program for the present school year, but it will go a long way toward that desired end.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Congress committed itself to this program last year, and I am very hopeful that this amendment will be adopted. I shall vote for and support the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, Federal funds allotted to Minnesota for the school hot-lunch program were exhausted on March 31, 1947. Approximately \$375,000 are needed to continue this worthy program in Minnesota for the remainder of the school year.

Daily, 150,000 to 160,000 children in Minnesota participated in the program, and the beneficial results are apparent in the improved health and physical well-being of our youth. We cannot allow the discontinuance of this program.

Parent-teacher groups, school boards, educators, and civic organizations have joined parents in a demand that their children be not sacrificed for the so-called mandates, campaign promises, and false economy expounded by the majority Members. I join our people in a concern for true economy, but it is not economical to sacrifice the health and well-being of growing children. This is penny-wise reasoning; a contribution toward adequate food for our

young people is a sound governmental investment. We are building for a healthy citizenry of tomorrow.

NEED HEALTHY CHILDREN

Much is said of the need to conserve our natural resources. Here are the most precious of all of America's resources. Our country must preserve its heritage. We need offer no apologies for our pride in our country and its people. But we cannot be merely satisfied. We must continue working for our country and its people. A well-fed, healthy child today becomes the backbone of a progressive, clear-thinking citizenry tomorrow.

We fear for the depletion of our mineral resources. With a wealth of minerals, they will do us little good unless we have the strong hands to mold them into the tools of an advanced civilization. The milk, soup, meat, and vegetables we provide now will strengthen those who will guide us tomorrow.

Make no mistake, the few dollars taken from these children are intended for those who need none of our sympathies. The few dollars sought here will be used as tax-relief for the big-income earners who have garnered more money than ever before in the history of our country.

I am personally familiar with the hot-lunch program. For some time before the war I helped administer the program in the rural schools of our communities. From the beginning, we could see the health of the pupils improve. A hot, balanced meal prepared by expert cooks, served under supervision, showed its results. That program expanded until almost every community in our area participated. There have been only words of praise from the parents and school officials. They now plead for a continuance.

SHOULD KEEP PROMISE

The Seventy-ninth Congress made our people a promise that the hot-lunch program would be a permanent project. Are we to breach the promise in this first year of its "permanence"? Depending upon the word of the Congress, States and school districts have gone to expense in providing their share of supplies and appliances. Are their contributions to be forfeited now? This Congress has a moral obligation to provide an adequate appropriation to carry the hot-lunch program through this year and to appropriate sufficient funds for the next school year.

I call upon my worthy colleagues to subordinate their concern for tax savings to the wealthy and to concentrate on building our national wealth, our children.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment which increases the school-lunch moneys by \$9,000,000. I have already heard from my home State of Louisiana and find that some 4 months before the end of the fiscal year, the school-lunch moneys were exhausted. As a result of this fact, the price of the school lunch to the children is increasing and unless additional funds are appropriated, the entire program may break down completely before July 1.

I believe \$9,000,000 will go far toward remedying the current shortage. In my judgment, the overspending by the several States is due to the encouragement which Congress has already given them. We have previously indicated we desire the program to expand and to include all poor children who do not have money to pay for their own lunches. No Government can justify a failure to take care of the hungry school children and at the same time export hundreds of tons of food to the hungry mouths overseas. I therefore hope very much that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment which I consider to be an expression of part of the national responsibility for health. The program of a hot lunch for school children has met with the universal approval of mothers, teachers, educational authorities, and Parent-Teacher Associations. The cost is infinitesimal compared to the benefits. The health of the child determines the health of the man. I look forward to legislation which will be a national expression of the responsibility for the health of all citizens. The continuation of the school-lunch program is an early and a necessary step.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this House, I introduced H. R. 1775, providing for \$15,000,000 for the school-lunch program. I feel that both the House and the Senate would be doing their duty toward the people of this country in making this \$15,000,000 appropriation for such a worthy program. However, since this amendment now before the House calls for only \$6,000,000, I am at a loss to understand how any Member can conscientiously vote against this amendment and then go home and face his people and try to answer for his action.

When we stop to consider that many of the Members of this Congress have appropriated millions of dollars to feed people all over the world, when we have appropriated money to prevent our cattle from being affected by the hoof-and-mouth disease from adjoining nations, it is inconceivable to understand why there should be any opposition to feeding our boys and girls throughout this Nation a good, nutritious, hot lunch—many of whom will go without if these funds are not provided. I know of no money that this Nation can spend more wisely than to provide and insure a well-balanced meal at lunchtime for the future citizens of this great Nation.

I am, therefore, in accord with this amendment, and shall support it, and my only regret being that it is for \$6,000,000 rather than \$15,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 88, noes 104.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON to act as tellers.

XCIH—189

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The clerk read as follows:

TUSOCK MOTH CONTROL

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations, independently or in cooperation with State agencies, associations, organizations, or individuals, to combat an outbreak of tussock moth, \$395,000, to remain available until December 31, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay the cost of property injured or destroyed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I watched this vote a minute ago with interest. Many of you will remember that a few weeks ago I engaged in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on this school-lunch program. The last 4 or 5 days that we have been debating appropriation bills I have been listening attentively to one phase, but this situation here a few minutes ago was slightly different.

I will say this to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who talked here a few minutes ago about lobbyists on the customs bill and about the letters that came out in mimeographed form putting the heat on, putting the pressure on: On this amendment here today you do not have that kind of lobbyist. I had a letter from the Governor of the State of Oklahoma. It was typewritten. I received a few scattered letters written with pencil on tablet paper from school children.

I can state that there is no red herring anyone can draw across the trail of this amendment; there is no lobby that will be the beneficiary of this amendment; no Edgar L. Warren will be the beneficiary of this amendment. The only beneficiaries of this item will be the school children of this Nation.

I wondered what the Republicans and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] were going to say to try to defeat it, and it comes down to this: Anything that takes money, no matter for what purpose, they are against it, whether it means the building of a strong Nation or not—they are still against it—and I do not believe you can point to anything that will build a stronger Nation than having healthy school children in this country. This is a sound program. You gentlemen on the left side of the aisle are so used to talking about boondoggling, waste, and extravagance that when a good bill comes before you, or a good amendment such as this one that was offered this afternoon, you forget and vote by habit, and vote against it. I am pleased to note that the vote in favor of this program has gained all the time this afternoon through pitiless publicity that was put out by the American people, not by paid lobbyists, not by mimeographed sheets, by just the conscience of American children calling out to you.

Down in my State we were a little bit worried about the Republicans last year. The fellow who ran against me said: "Send me up there and I will abolish OPA

and everything will be O. K." He never told the people he was going to abolish the school-lunch program, though.

This is something you are going to have to face. I want to make this observation: Here is a good bill. I was surprised that debate was shut off, because the American people would like to know what their chosen Representatives think about these things. No wonder you wanted to shut debate off. The vote, however, speaks for itself, and I think next fall you will find when you come before the people, when you are put on record, when you tell them what you are going to do, that some of you will have to vote as you did this afternoon. I do not know that these talks accomplish anything, but it is good to let the American people know. Maybe I am slightly presumptuous; I do not know, but I say to you, as I told the gentleman from New York: You did not get a mandate from the American people last fall to do what you tried to do this afternoon when you voted against the school-lunch program. If you had presented them with the kind of program you are putting through during this session I doubt if there would be as many over on the other side of the aisle as there are now, and when you get through with this session and come to the election in 1948 I think we are going to have slightly fewer on the other side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TABER and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Georgia was recognized before the gentleman from New York was on his feet.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquired as to why the gentleman from New York rose.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 103, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

National forest protection and management: The sum of \$410,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests under Weeks Act" to the appropriation "National forest protection and management."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen an example of what comes rather close to being a gag rule. I believe that no time is gained by efforts to shut off honest debate on a measure that Members are

honestly interested in and wish to present their views upon. Many Members desired to be heard on the merits of this amendment before the vote was taken. The rules permit that those who wish to speak may yet speak, as I am doing now, although, as the gentleman who just preceded me has pointed out, the vote has been taken, and what I say now cannot be considered with reference to the merits of the amendment.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in answer to a question from me stated that I requested to be heard before the Committee on Appropriations after hearings had ceased. No notice was given, so far as I know, to the membership of this House as to when hearings would cease on these deficiency items. I made what I thought was a timely request to come before that committee and be heard on behalf of citizens from my district who were vitally interested and who are vitally interested in this measure. Now, if the hearings had been closed, what was wrong with opening them and having some more hearings? I remember very well during this session when the critical condition of this country with reference to copper was brought to the attention of the House. The Committee on Ways and Means promptly called hearings on a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]. Hearings were had. They were not scheduled prior to the time that this situation was brought before the House. Possibly the Committee on Ways and Means may have more time to hear presentations of bills than the Committee on Appropriations; I do not know. But this was certainly an emergency measure. The money was running out on the 31st day of March, and it strikes me that the action of the chairman of this committee then was in keeping with his strenuous efforts here today to block the passage of this amendment. The gentleman first made a point of order which was overruled. Then when the Committee had given unanimous consent to the gentleman from Illinois to proceed for five additional minutes, giving him 10 minutes in all, the gentleman from New York moved that all debate close in 10 minutes. Many Members who had been on the floor clamoring for recognition were denied the right to say what they wished to say on the merits of the amendment. That is not good for legislation.

We know and concede that there is a larger Republican membership in this House than Democratic.

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said a lot of Members had not had the privilege of speaking on the amendment. Of course, the gentleman was not here during the Democratic reign in this House. If he had been, he would have seen the Democrats really put the bee on us by shutting off debate when there were possibly 25 of us who wanted to talk. There-

fore, I hope the gentleman will forget that kind of attack.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; I was not here then. If I had been here then, I would not have participated in that kind of movement.

I noticed that many Republicans voted for this amendment, and I want to express my personal appreciation of that. I know what it means to vote one way when the majority of the members of one's party are voting the other way. My purpose in making these remarks now is to say that I feel that it is for the good of the country that when Members want to debate the merits of a thing they should be allowed the opportunity to do so, and not have to place a statement in the RECORD that will have no effect whatever on the merits of the matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fighting forest fires: For an additional amount for fighting forest fires, fiscal year 1947, \$3,944,000.

FOREST SERVICE ITEMS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of explaining the four items approved by the committee for appropriation to the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

The first item was \$395,000 for the control against the tussock moth. This money will be used in connection with a joint effort by the State and Federal authorities to stamp out an outbreak of tussock moth which threatens valuable timber in northern Idaho. Funds have already been provided by the State for its share in the enterprise.

The second item is \$410,000 for the cruising and offering of timber for sale over and beyond the amount which would otherwise be handled this coming summer. The Forest Service estimates that the Government will receive at least \$2,000,000 from the sales of timber which this appropriation will permit. The current market for stumpage is the highest in forest service history. The cuttings to be authorized are all within the sustained yield cycle. The funds are made available by transfer from funds heretofore appropriated for acquisition of lands under the Weeks Act.

The third item is for control of tree-insect epidemics of national-forest lands in Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, in the amount of \$250,000. The committee was advised that, unless checked, these epidemics threaten to reach the scenic timber areas in the Jackson Hole country south of Yellowstone Park. While this situation does not have the same critical emergency character as that of the Tussock moth, and is more of the steady warfare which must be waged against enemies of the forest, the opportunity for making progress this season is good and the amount of \$250,000 will permit the organization of an effective campaign as time permits after the funds become available.

The fourth item is \$3,844,000 for fighting forest fires. The amount represents the full estimates of the Forest Service, based upon experience to date in this fiscal year.

Together, the approval of these four

items shows an appreciation of Forest Service problems which will please those who follow such matters, I feel certain. They provide real forest conservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1947," \$1,900,000.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in rebuttal to the statement of the gentleman of the committee who, when our distinguished colleague from Georgia protested at the manner in which he was taken off his feet previously, said that the Democrats had put the bee on the Republicans for the past number of years. Apparently that is what the Republicans intend to do to us, and without justification.

I challenge the gentleman to point out one instance in all the times when the Democrats were in the majority when a Member was on the floor and asked for 5 minutes additional time and when that time was courteously granted by the minority as we did today, when, in all that time, can the gentleman point out an instance, where, as soon as an extra 5 minutes was unanimously granted that the chairman of a committee or anybody else on the Democratic side ever rose and moved that there should be no more time except to the man who got the five additional minutes, leaving the other Members without an opportunity to speak.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I shall not yield now.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of representative government are we going to have if the minority may not even rise and express an opinion? What kind of government are we going to have if the Members of the minority may not be permitted to speak before our committees? We have seen this same thing happen in the Committee on Ways and Means where members were not allowed to speak. Here we are seeing the same Republican formula being adopted in the House. For what reason? Because they have the votes to limit debate—yes, to prevent debate. The country knows you have the votes. The country knows also that you have the responsibilities of government in your hands. The country knows that despite the fact that you have been endeavoring to shut off debate and apply the gag rule you have not brought out a single worth-while bill since you took over the House on the 3d of January. If this continues, you will lose the complete confidence of the country—whatever confidence the country may now have in you, after you have been in control for the past 3 months.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. May I say to the gentleman that I do not doubt he can get all the time he wants to get.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman can get all the time he wants. He can make a motion to strike out the last word. You know how to get time. But on your side

it is different; you have more votes than we have, and you can stop us from talking. The majority have stopped us from talking when we had 8 or 10 men standing here who wanted to speak on the school-lunch program and the Republicans would not give them a chance to speak.

As has been said, there is a very good reason why you would not want us to argue about the school lunches; a very good reason why you would not want the people to know that despite all your promises about what you are going to do for the country, you do not even want to give school lunches to the undernourished and underprivileged American children, although we have given and will undoubtedly continue to give, millions of dollars to feed the people of other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Of course, it is not necessary for me to stand here to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], because everyone who was in the House during the reign of the New Deal knows that the gentleman was just making a talk to the gallery. The gentleman knows, as everyone knows, that many times the Republicans were shut off from debate, even when the lives of American boys were at stake, and you know it. It was regular procedure for you fellows to shut off debate as the records will prove.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504), fiscal year 1947, \$20,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this \$20,000,000 to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is twenty millions more going down the rat hole of the worst administration of a public corporation I have ever seen administered by our Government since I have been in Congress. In 5 years they have squandered in the capital stock of the corporation \$90,000,000, besides expense money appropriated by Congress of close to \$50,000,000; also a profit made on wheat in 1945 of over \$8,000,000, besides all the premiums received for insurance. It shows up the incompetence of the organization. I have been in correspondence and by personal visits with the authorities. They stated in 1945 that their experience would enable them to work with more efficiency, and experience would cause them to do a sound insurance business. The results, however, are worse from 1945 to date than they were before. Federal crop insurance will never be a success—when it is under such supervision and administration.

It is a racket, and not sound business. If you want to aid the farmers do so without a Government pay roll of millions annually to the party faithful. Cut out the dishonesty by calling it insurance and causing unnecessary and untimely expenses of government. It is a racket and the Department of Agriculture should recommend its discontinuance at once. I have offered a bill to that end.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surgeon General", \$82,100;

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of title I be considered as read and be open to amendment. It is all Pay Act legislation. There is nothing else in the balance of that title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202 (a) For the payment of a judgment, rendered against the Government of the United States by a United States district court under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes", approved March 9, 1920 (46 U. S. C. 741 and the following), and which was certified to the Eightieth Congress in House Document Numbered 126 under the War Department, \$5,850.

Mr. TABER (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read down to section 203 and that it may be open to amendment at this time. There is no controversy down to that point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy Department, \$201,501.58;

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS:
On page 46, between lines 8 and 9 insert as follows: "Federal Communications Commission \$161.61."

Page 46, line 15, strike out "\$164,500.45." and insert in lieu thereof "\$166,496.85."

Page 46, line 16, strike out "and."
Page 46, after the number "45910" insert "46026."

Page 46, line 22, strike out "\$2,102,638.17." and insert "\$2,104,796.18."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment comes too late. The Clerk has read beyond that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman comes too late.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it this amendment was on the Clerk's desk and the fact it was not reported was due to the Clerk's failing to see the amendment. The parliamentary inquiry is: Does it come too late when the amendment was on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama was not present to protect his rights and the Clerk continued to read beyond the point where the amendment should properly have been offered.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I was here but I did not know just where the Clerk was reading. I ask unanimous consent to return to the point where the amendment would be germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his gracious kindness. I appreciate it very deeply.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to put into this bill provision for the payment of those judgments which have been rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. No such provision is now carried in this bill.

These three judgment creditors of our Government are no longer in Government service. They have been separated therefrom for more than 3 years. No question is here involved of taking them off of any pay roll.

The question is: Shall we repudiate these debts of our Government? Or, phrasing it more specifically: Shall we appropriate the \$2,104,796.18 required to pay all of the judgments of the United States Court of Claims now past due and unpaid or shall we appropriate the \$2,102,638.17 that would pay them all except three, totaling \$2,158.01?

Each Member's answer to those questions depends not so much on how fiercely he hates the victims as upon how much he loves our Government. Another question guides the answer your vote will make. How much do you hate the decisions of the courts that decreed payment? Or this: Shall the Congress keep the faith and do its plain duty?

If you don't like the decision rendered by the Court of Claims, which Congress created, you have more legal right to vote to abolish that court than to repudiate a judgment Congress empowered it to render.

I have just as much right to vote to deny the payment of the salaries fixed by law for the members of the Court of Claims, or of the Supreme Court of the United States, as I have to so treat those appointed in accordance with the law Congress wrote governing appointments in the executive branch of our Government.

It is just as legal for us to wreck the Government by wholesale as by retail.

We could gain absolute power quicker if we could abolish the other two equal, free, coordinate branches of the Government designed by our forefathers and prescribed by the Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield briefly, but I want to make my own speech, if you please.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has said that if this line of reasoning is correct, we could take the salary away from the judiciary.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is unmindful of the fact that the Constitution itself says that they shall hold office during good behavior and shall at stated times receive for their services compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office. Certainly, to take it away would be to diminish it.

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all, sir. You propose to extinguish it—to wipe it out. And with no reference to "good behavior." In the Watson, Dodd, and Lovett cases there has been not so much as a syllable of criticism of their demeanor. They are to be punished, if you prevail, for the entertainment of a past belief, which, according to the testimony, never affected their performance of duty while in office.

So, I repeat, and challenge successful controversy, that you can just as legally deny all pay for the members of the Supreme Court or of the Court of Claims as for these three men.

But, my hypothesis was, as correctly stated by the gentleman: if the gentleman's line of reasoning is correct. And on that fallacious basis, may I ask: "Since that line of reasoning shows no regard for the Constitution, why claim it as binding in one case and not in another?"

In conclusion I must fling this challenge: Very emphatically, I am against all lynching, whoever may compose the mob, however high may be their motives, and no matter that the victim be our system of government!

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before the legislation was passed which prohibited the payment of funds to Watson, Lovett, and Dodd, the Committee on Appropriations had hearings, and these three men appeared before a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, and on which served such outstanding Members of the House as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. From the testimony of these three men, out of their own mouths, it was apparent that they were not loyal to the United States and that they did not owe their first loyalty to the United States. Following that, in accordance with the law, payments were not made to them, and they brought suit and the suit resulted in this judgment.

This is not the first time such a thing has happened. In the Dalton case, about 1930, when the Honorable Will Wood was chairman of the House Com-

mittee on Appropriations, a judgment for \$11,900 was obtained under circumstances of very questionable character. The committee refused to consider it and refused to report the funds to pay it. Later further attempts were made to get the money, and an application was made to the committee when the Honorable James P. Buchanan, of Texas, was chairman, and that was refused.

The Constitution provides:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

We are not given authority over these things without having a discretion to exercise. If we exercise that discretion in our conscience, believing that this judgment should not be paid and that it is not a proper obligation of the United States, we are performing our duty. Otherwise we are abdicating the duty which the Constitution places upon us.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Was not the Dalton case one in which the Congress had refused to provide funds for the extinguishment of a claim which was subsequently pressed in a court and a judgment obtained?

Mr. TABER. No; it was not. It was not that kind of case.

Mr. WALTER. It was not for salary, was it?

Mr. TABER. It was for retirement pay, at a time when Dalton was working for and drawing a salary from the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

If the founding fathers had expected that a judgment of a court required funds to come out of the Treasury automatically, regardless of the proprieties, they would have so provided in the Constitution. At one time we had a law in effect that such a judgment should be paid automatically by the Treasury, but that has been repealed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to prevent any part of an appropriation made several years ago to go for the payment of compensation to Dodd, Watson, and whoever the third man was—Lovett. But that is not the question before the House today. There is only one question involved and that is, as I see it: Are we, the legislative branch, going to take a step that will nullify the judgment of the Court of last resort of our land? That is the only question involved here today.

I can remember over the years how jealous we have been of our prerogatives when the courts have done what we considered an invasion of the legislative field. But it certainly seems to me that there would be just as much justification for the Chief Executive to call out the armed forces to enforce an administrative order in conflict with the judgment of the legislative branch as it would be for us to refuse to honor the judgment of the Supreme Court.

I shall not discuss the decision in the Lovett case. It has been discussed on several occasions since this bill has been called up. But suffice to say that

the Court reached the conclusion that these men were entitled to compensation. That is the last word from our Supreme Court. I do not think any of us want to weaken in one single iota any of the powers of any one of the three coordinate branches of our Government.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. My distinguished friend is a member, as I understand it, of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House. Has not your committee recently approved an act to nullify the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in the portal-to-portal cases?

Mr. WALTER. The Committee on the Judiciary has reported on numerous occasions legislation designed not to nullify but to restate the law where it has been very clear that the courts have invaded the legislative field. Certainly we did not do anything to nullify a decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called portal-to-portal cases. That was not the situation at all.

I am sure my friend has not examined carefully the Mount Clemens case.

But the point is, where will we go next if we refuse to honor and recognize the judgment of the Supreme Court? What will the next move be? It can be almost anything. It seems to me before we take this very important step we should carefully weigh the consequences.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the men who wrote our Constitution were experts in government. They thought in terms of government. They were familiar with every experiment in human government from the dawn of history down to their day. They knew that the mightiest instrumentality of governmental power is in the purse. Therefore they lodged the power over the people's pocketbooks, the power to tax, and the power to appropriate money primarily in the House of Representatives. If we surrender in this instance our right to control the purse, we will have surrendered the greatest prerogative with which this House is vested for the defense of the liberties of the people and the preservation of our institutions. The keynote of the whole controversy is in the discretion of the House. We have discretion in this matter that is inherent in the powers of the House. The simple test is this: Has any court in the land the power to mandamus and compel the Congress to appropriate money in discharge of a judgment that runs counter to our conception of what the powers of the House are? Do not be mistaken about this matter. This is the opening gun in the fight of this Congress and the American people to purge the public pay roll of men and women who do not believe in our form of government and who are in the positions they now hold with the avowed and settled purpose of overthrowing, hamstringing, and destroying this Government. If we do not vote to withhold this money which we have steadfastly declined to appropriate, then we cannot get rid of any of these men that the President says he now wants to

ferret out, expose, and get rid of. This is a power that we should not surrender, and I am not disturbed about this judgment of the Supreme Court. Let the Supreme Court follow down the path that Presidents and other judges have followed and then will be time enough for us to consider whether or not we will surrender this great power of purse, and this power of discretion which, in my opinion, it is our sworn duty to exercise under our oath of office. Let us vote down this amendment and preserve this power of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any more fundamental question that can arise in this Congress than the one now before us in reference to the payment and the discharge of these purported judgments. These employees had an opportunity to stay on the public pay roll of this Government. This House and the Senate of the United States provided in an action concerning their payment, that if they were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, they could stay here. They never undertook to ask anybody to appoint them or to approve of their appointment. They continued the work they were doing, after they were ordered stricken from the pay roll, and they remained until they had secured enough salary in order to bring an action against the United States Government. They proceeded to sue us in the Court of Claims, and the case finally went to the Supreme Court of the United States. These employees, Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett, were not deprived of their offices and they were given an opportunity, if they complied with the requirements of Congress, to keep their jobs and not lose them. They declined to do this in the light of the evidence against them and they remained on their respective jobs long enough, and in violation of the law of Congress, to acquire a sufficient amount of salary, as they thought, to bring an action against the Government.

There has been a great deal said today about the legal question involved in this controversy. I think the power of the purse is a very fundamental principle involved in the legislation of this country, and I am satisfied that the men who made the Constitution and created this Government, of which we are so proud, determined that the representatives of the people, the Congress of this country, should pass upon the fairness of all claims, the justice of a claim, and the legality of any claim. The position that the Court has taken has been misunderstood. For just a few minutes I wish to read to you what the Court has said in respect to this kind of action. I believe this House will understand very well why Mr. Dodd, Mr. Lovett, and Mr. Watson were asked to get off the pay roll of this Nation. I think certainly the large majority of this House understands it full well.

The Supreme Court has never held that Congress must pay any claim or debt against the Government. In the case of

Reside v. Walker (11 Howard 272), a verdict had been rendered in favor of an employee of the Post Office Department to pay certain compensation for services. The Supreme Court held as follows:

The difficulty in the way is the want of an appropriation by Congress to pay this claim. It is a well-known constitutional provision that no money can be taken or drawn from the Treasury except under an appropriation by Congress.

That is one of the leading cases, and it is a case to which my distinguished friend from Alabama referred on a previous occasion.

The Court went on to say:

However much money may be in the Treasury at any one time, not a dollar can be used in the payment of anything not thus previously sanctioned. Any other course would give to the fiscal officers a most dangerous discretion. But without such an appropriation it cannot and should not be paid by the Treasury, whether the claim is by a verdict or judgment, or without either.

This fundamental doctrine has never been overruled.

There is another opinion of the Supreme Court to which I wish to call your attention which clearly declares that Congress is within its fundamental rights, that we are protecting the people of this Nation as the makers of the Constitution intended they should be protected.

The situation was summed up by the Federal District Court in California in the case of *Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft* (60 Fed. Supp. 985). In that case the Court held as follows:

The purpose of the appropriations, the terms and conditions under which said appropriations were made, is a matter solely in the hands of Congress and it is the plain and explicit duty of the executive branch of the Government to comply with the same. Any attempt by the judicial branch of our Government to interfere with the exclusive powers of Congress would be a plain invasion of the powers of said body conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States.

I could cite many other cases holding to the same effect, that it makes no difference what sort of claim may be brought against the Government, the claimant cannot get his money until the representatives of the people say it shall be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal of discussion about the Supreme Court here this afternoon on this amendment. I wish to call attention to one fact, and that is that the members of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President, whereas the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people. I believe that puts us just a little closer to the people and more in touch with their ideas than possibly some of the members of the Supreme Court. For just a minute I wish to review some of the history of this case.

Mr. Chairman, in the early part of the Seventy-eighth Congress, in reporting out an appropriation bill, funds were denied these three gentlemen, Dodds, Watson, and Lovett. When the Democrats

at that time saw what was going to happen they desperately rushed in a resolution, setting up a special committee to investigate whether or not these three men were subversive. That was done, even though the Committee on Un-American Activities had made a report on them and the Appropriations Committee had made a report on them. They appointed a Democratic-controlled committee, chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who just preceded me. That committee, after an investigation, brought in a report recommending that these three men should not continue on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone can vote for this amendment if he will but take the time to read the testimony taken before that committee, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. That report was unanimous?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. The gentleman from Illinois is correct when he says the report was unanimous.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the question of the politics of these three men involved or is it a question of whether the House should honor a decision of the Supreme Court? Is that not the fundamental question?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not agree with the gentleman that the fundamental question is whether or not we are going to honor a Supreme Court decision. I will say it is not a question of politics because it was a Democratic-controlled committee that brought in an adverse report on these three men.

One thing further. If the Members will read the report they will find this language:

Upon consideration of all the evidence your committee finds the membership and association of Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., with the organizations mentioned, and his expressed views and philosophies of government constitutes subversive activity within the definition adopted by the committee, and that he is, therefore, unfit for the present to continue in Government employment.

If you will refer to pages 4480 to 4484 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1943 of the Seventy-eighth Congress you will find that I gave a rather extensive account of some of these gentlemen in a speech I made at that time.

I do not see how you are going to uphold the hands of the President of the United States in support of his order of a week ago last Saturday to rid our Government of subversives and vote for this amendment. The President came out with an order, of which I have a copy and a full report of his committee. If you are going to start getting rid of these fellow travelers, Communists, and subversives in our Government, it would certainly be a very poor start to vote for this amendment which in effect pays the salaries of these three men accumulated under the circumstances explained a few

minutes ago by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The Honorable Clinton Anderson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, a member of the committee to investigate Dodd, Watson, and Lovett, made a fine speech as to the fact the committee found these three men subversive and unfit for Government employment. In the final analysis it is a privilege to be employed by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of true Americanism this amendment should be defeated and I hope it will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that a judgment of the Supreme Court is a very solemn obligation which we should not, dare not repudiate in this Chamber. We would weaken the forces of law and order. We would encourage disregard of the decrees of all courts. Anarchy would follow.

There has been much said derogatory of the Supreme Court here in the debate this afternoon. But, of course, it all depends upon whose ox is gored. Some of the very men who made these statements against the Supreme Court acclaimed that Court a few days ago when it rendered the Lewis decision.

There is a great deal of hysteria developing in our campaign against the Reds, but that hysteria should not rob us of our common sense and of our wisdom in legislating here. If this body can in an appropriation bill chop off the appropriations of an officer say, of the Virgin Islands government, it could by token of the same reasoning or lack of reasoning chop off the salary of a district judge or chop off the salary of an ambassador; the salary of the President himself. You might say that is far-fetched, but not so many moons ago in this very Chamber there was an oligarchy of legislators, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, who did things that seem rather queer to us now. By legislative fiat he practically ran the Government and trampled upon the Executive and the judiciary. He impeached the President on grounds which were subsequently declared utterly and willfully unconstitutional. This House, under Thaddeus Stevens, not only wanted to cut the salary of President Johnson, but wanted his scalp as well. Many things can happen in this very Chamber if we do not beware and if we are not careful of what we do. If the pending amendment fails, we repudiate the judgment of our highest Court—the Court to which the opponents of this amendment would quickly repair if they got into trouble and needed its help. Yes; we have the power of the purse, as has been indicated this after-

noon, and we are given that power by the Constitution, but there is also the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder and ex post facto laws. One part of the Constitution is as sacred as the other. The opponents apparently and deliberately close their eyes to those portions of the Constitution which protect the liberties of the individual and guard against undue encroachments upon those liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gwynne].

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me assure you I am not speaking at all because of any affection for Mr. Watson or Mr. Dodd or the type of government they apparently believe in. I am speaking because of a deep and abiding affection for sound principles of constitutional government. I would regret it if this amendment were not adopted. When we had the original amendment here to remove Dodd and Watson from the pay roll I voted against the amendment on the theory that it was a bill of attainder. The court has simply done its duty. It has recognized an obligation which I think we did not recognize when we adopted that amendment and has said that these people were not taken from the pay roll in a proper manner. In accordance with their duty as they saw it they rendered a judgment.

We must distinguish between the power to do something and the right to do it. Of course we have the power to refuse to appropriate the money. If we should disagree with the Supreme Court we have the power to refuse to appropriate the money for their salaries or to run their institution. Nevertheless, we have no right to do it, and we have violated our oath of office, in my judgment, if we put our conduct on the naked question of power regardless of the question of the right. The court is a coordinate branch of the Government. It has in the exercise of its power and authority rendered a judgment which I think it is our duty to uphold.

This is not similar to the portal-to-portal case. The right of Congress after a judgment has been rendered, after a decision has been made, to rewrite the law for the future is unquestioned. That is a question of policy. But the portal-to-portal bill, if you read it carefully, recognizes that we had no right to interfere with the judgment which was beyond appeal, and we specifically excluded that in that measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy].

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reason the Committee on Un-American Activities called Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett subversive was that these men favored a government that was totalitarian, a government that operated through the one-party system. The strength of America, it seems to me, is in the balance of power between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our Government. If because we have the power in this chamber to do so, we should hold back payment of this money to these men

and not honor the decision of the Supreme Court we would be breaking down that division, which at this particular time is all-important. I therefore feel it essential to our integrity and to the integrity of our Government that this claim be honored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating].

Mr. Keating. Mr. Chairman, up our way the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stands high in the estimation of everyone. His integrity and singleness of purpose are the objects of our utmost admiration. I know he is utterly sincere in the position he takes and the same remark applies to the committee which has favorably reported this bill. It is with great regret that I find myself in disagreement with my esteemed colleague. But I must join my distinguished colleague from Iowa of the Committee on the Judiciary in what he has so forcefully and so well said.

The amount involved here is only a little over \$2,000, so small, in fact, that one scarcely dares mention the sum in official Washington. But the principle involved, it seems to me, is basic and fundamental—more so, in fact, than any yet faced by this Congress. To deny this appropriation strikes at the very heart of our system of government. I do not know any of these men. I never heard of them until this bill was brought to the floor. So far as I have been able to learn, their conduct as employees of this Government was thoroughly reprehensible. I am entirely ready to assume that it is a fact, as stated by the chairman in his opening remarks, that the evidence showed that these men did not owe, or pay, their first loyalty to the United States.

Nevertheless, they went to court with their claims, were sustained in the Court of Claims, and the judgments which they recovered were affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States. The only way whereby they can translate their piece of paper called a judgment, into cash in hand, is through an appropriation made by this Congress. No matter how violently I may disagree with the decision rendered by our highest court, I am unwilling to lend the support of my vote to the use of this process to render such a judgment ineffectual. If we seize the power to nullify this judgment, where are we to stop? What limit shall we set on the substitution of our discretion for the solemn pronouncement of our highest court?

My sincere and able friend defends the elimination of these items from the bill by saying that there is precedent for such action by Congress as is here recommended. I am not familiar with the case to which he refers. But my answer is unhesitatingly that if such precedents exist they are fundamentally wrong. No matter what some previous Congress has seen fit to do, I cannot support or vote for a proposition which does violence, in my judgment, to the doctrine of the separation of powers between the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of our Government. The very structure of the American political sys-

tem rests upon the mutual regard and respect of the three coordinate elements which compose it.

Accordingly, I shall support the amendment which has been offered to make provision for the payment of these judgments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us be cool and keep our feet on the ground. These are indeed serious times through which we are passing. Let us not do unlawful things and foolish things in a moment of caprice or a moment of madness.

The Supreme Court of the United States determines lawsuits. It has determined these lawsuits and has rendered its solemn judgment. In my judgment we have no right under our theory of government to deny these judgments by refusal to make sufficient appropriations to pay them.

I know nothing in the world about these men. I assume from what has been said that they are not in any way the type of men that I would approve of. I do not know anything about them, but it is not for this body to judge that in this instance. Their case was for the Supreme Court to determine. It was for the Court to determine whether or not they were entitled to their money. Since it has so determined, I believe we have no right to deny it. We have no lawful right to deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am so conscious of my limitations in the field of constitutional law that I am most reluctant to match wits with the very distinguished lawyers of this House. Yet, I find myself in disagreement with so many eminent gentlemen from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let us look at the matter in this way, quite aside from the ideology that is involved and quite aside from the emotionalism.

You will remember surely those cases in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the gold clause, and especially the notable case of Perry against the United States, in which the Supreme Court said: "Why, indeed, you are in possession of a piece of paper. It has language in it that provides that on the tendering of this bond you can be paid in gold." But the Court said: "You are without a remedy. It is a charge upon the conscience of the sovereign"—and the sovereign might in this case be the Congress. It said: "Indeed, you have a valid contract; but, unfortunately, there is no remedy by which you can pursue your right. There is no way by which you can compel action on it and get payment in gold. You have to be paid in paper."

Now, here are three gentlemen who, in my considered judgment, in the first instance came into court with unclean hands. But the fact remains, they have a judgment. Now, the question is, What remedy is available to them? The Supreme Court said they are entitled to

the money. But that does not mean that the Congress must appropriate the money any more than the Congress was required to set up a procedure to pay the holders of every gold bond in the country. The Court said it was a charge on the conscience of the sovereign, but did the sovereign do anything about it? The sovereign did exactly nothing. Every holder of a bond that had a gold clause in it had to take paper money as payment. The sovereign did nothing. Now, must the sovereign do something in this instance? Must the sovereign now, notwithstanding the fact that here is a valid judgment, take action to honor that judgment? In my opinion, the sovereign in this case, the Congress, has no such obligation. Let us not forget that we did not take these gentlemen off of the roll. What we did was this: We put a proviso in the urgent deficiency bill in 1943 stating that they can have no money until they are confirmed by the Senate. They had to be appointed and confirmed by the Senate. They did not go and get confirmation from the Senate. What they did was this: They remained on the rolls in defiance of the Congress and in contempt of the Congress until there had accrued sufficient pay to make out a case, and then they went into the Court of Claims. But in the same proportion that the Supreme Court said in the Perry case, "While the Congress is under no duty to provide remedies through the courts, the contractual obligations do exist, and despite the infirmities of procedure, remain binding upon the conscience of the sovereign." So we have much on our conscience, because all holders of those gold contracts were never paid. I am willing to charge my conscience with one more thing and not appropriate money for this purpose.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RABIN. If the Supreme Court decided in the Perry case that we should pay in gold, should we not pay it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It said there was an obligation on the sovereign.

Mr. RABIN. Had they said we should have paid in gold, should we not have paid in gold?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not, because we had taken away their remedy. In other words, there was no way for them to enforce it. But let us not forget that the Congress of the United States is, after all, a coordinate branch of this Government, made up of three separate and distinct and independent branches. Here is an element of discretion, and while our conscience is charged with it, yet we are under no obligation to pay it.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am very much troubled in attempting to follow the gentleman's judgment, whether two wrongs make a right. Is this not another wrong?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. This is wholly within the realm of rights of Congress. In other words, we have the discretion whether we are going to set up procedure and that procedure would have to go through all the necessary motions of

the Appropriations Committee to get the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOBBS) there were—ayes 86, noes 97.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this vote on whether a final judgment of our Supreme Court should be paid is a very difficult vote. I voted for the original law striking Dodds, Watson, and Lovett from the Federal pay roll. I thought then, and still think, that they were and are unworthy to be on the Government pay roll because of their subversive views. I disagree with the Supreme Court decision which held that law of Congress unconstitutional.

In voting to pay this judgment I am upholding a judgment I disagree with; these men have shown their willingness to overthrow the very Constitution which the Supreme Court invoked in awarding this judgment.

Nevertheless, I voted for the Hobbs amendment appropriating funds to pay this judgment. No one can sue the United States unless Congress grants the right. These cases were properly filed in the Court of Claims according to the laws laid down by Congress. A final judgment was duly obtained against the United States of America. We may have the power to refuse to pay that judgment, but I feel we do not have the right to do it. Congress should act to pay money judgments obtained by citizens against the Government, in accordance with the laws provided by Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Naval procurement fund," \$4,817,350.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 49, after line 9, insert:

"Pay, subsistence, and transportation, 1945.....	\$55,000,000
Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946.....	130,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1945.....	4,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946.....	12,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy, 1945.....	9,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy, 1946.....	40,000,000
Fuel and transportation, Navy, 1945.....	10,000,000
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:	
Medical Department, Navy, 1945.....	5,500,000
Medical Department, Navy, 1946.....	7,000,000
Bureau of Ships: Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1945.....	100,000,000

to a maximum of 1 percent with an average well below one-half of 1 percent. Proper protection of millions of our American families requires that effective rent and eviction control be extended beyond June 30, 1947, for a further period of 1 year, and I so recommend.

As for the agency of the Government to administer rent controls, it was my original recommendation that the Office of Temporary Controls be assigned this responsibility. However, recent legislation requires the liquidation of that agency, and a bill now under consideration by the Senate would transfer these functions to the Housing Expediter. I raise no objection to this proposal.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 1, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 1439, and include a statement by John J. Giltinan.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE GREEK AND TURKISH SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this day I rise to speak as an American citizen deeply devoted to my country and filled with loyalty for her. Our country stands at a crossroad, the most hazardous in her history. What you and I do now will undoubtedly set the course of our national policy so inexorably that we shall be caught in a politico-military tide from which there is no escaping. True it is that the President sets the course of our foreign policy; but equally true is the fact that Congress must appropriate the money and therefore share full responsibility for the consequences of the policies toward Greece and Turkey, and other countries.

It has become customary to brand independent thinking on foreign affairs as isolationism. If my remarks are construed within that category, gentlemen, I shall accept the accusation with pleasure, because I speak as my conscience dictates. I am an American, a citizen of the United States of America and my first consideration is for my country. If that be treason, make the most of it.

We have thrown the gauntlet to one of the most powerful nations in the world and we propose to embark upon a series of international adventures that can lead only to heartache, human suffering and national bankruptcy. We have been asked—and appear to have accepted—the role of bankrupt Great Britain. Although she was the world's richest and most powerful state for over a century, she did not have wealth enough to continue her imperialism indefinitely and avoid economic disaster. And now with that object lesson before us, we propose to pour our good money into the same bottomless well. I say that rich as we are we do not have and never

can have enough money to fill the well of British imperialism.

We are told by the President that the money requested is to fight communism abroad. That is a worthy enterprise as far as that doctrine and its practice oppose our free institutions. But how does the President hope to fight communism abroad when it is rampant within our own country? Why did he not appear before us recommending measures for its eradication from our own governmental departments here in Washington long before he did? When does he propose to clean out some of our own domestic hotbeds? Surely, we are not so naive as to believe that we can fight a doctrine abroad and still have that doctrine preached to us by our own governmental departments here at home. How do we expect to carry on the fight against communism abroad when the boring from within menaces the foundations of our Government at home? The fellow travelers are found in high places. Secretaries of Commerce are not the only ones who are susceptible to these leftist doctrines.

But fighting communism is only a cloak for the more fundamental and underlying power politics which is being played. It is not food and relief which are in question. Everyone of us is for that, and Congress has already before it measures for the granting of relief. Nor is this simply a loan. Look at the matter in its broader implications. The \$400,000,000 is only the initial loan. We are to have the right to send American troops to Turkey and Greece. We are to combine loans and troops with relief and food. But in addition we have been asked to pass the President's budget with few cuts. We are asked to pass the Army and Navy merger, and finally to enact compulsory military service. Thus we are asked not only to embark on a hazardous foreign venture whose outcome none of us can envision, but we are granting to the military cliques complete control of our Government. In short, what is there to distinguish us in that respect from totalitarian regimes? Already the military rules our State Department. For the first time in history a general is the Secretary of State. Too many generals now fill our diplomatic posts.

If I read history correctly, this is alien to American ways of thinking. For we have always kept the military establishments in balance. We are become a war, not a peace state. What did we fight two world wars for—more war and the loss of our freedom? We are in the midst of setting our course along militaristic and imperialistic lines which contradict the bases of American thought and our beliefs. Equally disturbing is the fact that our contemplated conduct runs contrary to the foundations of our foreign policy. Hear what George Washington said in his Farewell Address. He saw more clearly than we do in an equally disturbed era.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let

them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements.

And then, of course, while President Monroe said:

We owe, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Are we to do to Europeans what we forbid them to do to us? President Monroe also said:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries and make preparation for our defense.

On September 12, 1940, Senator Nye said of the Monroe Doctrine:

In very brief language, the two paragraphs together mean just this:

1. We want no part of anything in Europe and we aren't interested in interfering in Europe. Our best interests are served by staying out of European power politics.
2. But we intend that Europe shall stay out of the Americas; we will not stand for its interference in our affairs or the affairs of our sister republics, and any European nation attempting to so interfere in any of these nations will have us to reckon with.

And now because British imperialism has led that country to make commitments, which she no longer can fulfill, notwithstanding our billions to her, President Truman asks us to take up the burden, jettison the bases of our foreign policy, which have led us to greatness, and contradict the wisdom of our years. To all this, American interests dictate an emphatic "No." We have fought aggression in two major wars. Do we now propose to succumb to it ourselves? Where is the line of our true interests to be drawn? Did I not hear over the radio the other day that some of our military experts are already contemplating outposts on Mars and the Moon for the conduct of atomic warfare? Where do we propose to stop?

I said, and I repeat, the course the President recommends is dangerous, unnecessarily so. We were responsible for the League of Nations, and have been

equally responsible for the United Nations organization, to whose institution we have subscribed from the very beginning. Is there not an effective Food and Agricultural Organization and an International Bank which can handle much of the Greek relief which the President proposes? Russia is not a member of either one. Surely, if Greece needs help and we fear Russia, then the United Nations organization should now be used by us. We are reverting to independent national action which is a sure road to war, when there lies at hand an international agency whose use will lead to peace.

I think the President has already made a grave mistake in bypassing the United Nations in this matter. The United Nations is the only international organization we have today which can further the cause of peace. The United States has taken the lead in promoting the United Nations organization, and it therefore behooves us to aid in every way if it is ever to amount to anything at all. If we bypass the United Nations organization now we will brand it useless in the sight of the nations of the world.

The President owes it to our people and to the world to present the case of Greece and Turkey to the Security Council and to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and request them to act and do so now. They should assume the responsibility, not the United States as proposed by President Truman. Only one other alternative comes to mind, and that will be, give the money to the churches—Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew—and ask them to send their communicants into Greece to alleviate suffering from hunger, cold, and disease. Religion is more vital than weapons. Religion is to be more welcome to a war-torn people than the form of government they have.

When men rule people in their own way and by their own methods, by force or otherwise, they are most likely to fail. When men join up with God and ask Him to lead the way they succeed if they will follow Him.

I believe the failure of the United Nations to date is because they did not nor do not ask divine guidance in their deliberations at their sessions. Men win with God—men fail without God.

What makes this matter of aid to Greece so urgent? Are we just becoming aware of the situation and would be panicked into action? Surely Greece has needed assistance for a long time. That war-torn country has been helped time and time again, both privately and publicly, by the Government and the citizens of the United States. If Russia disturbs us so much, where was our State Department when the treaties of peace were drawn up with Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria? Do we hope to contain the Russian State within its own borders when it is already surrounded by friendly neighboring states frankly distrusting the United States?

There is chaos and confusion in the recommended course of action, which can only grow more pronounced as we proceed along the path laid out for us. This is not a question of backing the

Government, or bipartisan policy, or even of party interests. This is a matter of the true and sound course of American policy, much broader than the interests of any individual or any official institution or group of people. It is as broad as our country itself.

Read the headlines of the news stories and editorials which appeared at the time the President delivered his address. Here are some: "Russia's bawling out," "Get ready for war," "Taft probes likelihood of Soviet war if United States aids Greece and Turkey," "America's new role." Can there be any question as to the significance of the course we are taking?

A little over a year ago we sent an international commission into Greece to observe the elections there. Was that the forerunner of much more expansive action to come? Greece is no democracy; to inject ourselves into her domestic affairs gives us the choice between, on the one hand, communism and its allied forces, and, on the other hand, an unpopular, dictatorial monarchy whose only excuse for living is that Britain established it there. Nowhere is democracy.

To vote the Greek and Turkish recommendations will commit this country to an impossible task and will convert it in the eyes of the world from a haven and refuge for the oppressed and, therefore, the most popular country, into the most unpopular country charged with interfering everywhere. The contemplated program is impossible to fulfill. Taking the world as a whole, we have only a comparatively small part of the manpower and a comparatively small part of the wealth. Let us not forget how near disaster we were just 4 short years ago. A little more weight on the side of the enemy, his election of different courses of action, might well have prolonged the war indefinitely. For the moment we are the most powerful state in the world. Let us not use that power to create conflict but rather let us use it to promote peace, understanding and good will. Russia can be fought with armies, but communism cannot be killed by bayonets or rifles; nor will a loan of \$400,000,000 kill it in Greece, Turkey or the rest of the world. And when will the American taxpayer stop having to contribute? After Greece and Turkey comes Korea, then Rumania, Yugoslavia, Finland, and all the border states of Russia. Such a program would commit us indefinitely to unproductive budgets of billions.

I would remind my brother Congressmen that while we like to think of ourselves as wealthy, almost a decade and a half of the New Deal and a World War have mortgaged our wealth in an unprecedented fashion. We are talking of balancing the budget and tax cuts in this session. I venture to predict that if we embark upon this course we may be the last Congress to talk in these terms.

There are so many reasons against this course of action that it is impossible to give them without exhausting your patience. May I close by quoting the reactions of one of my constituents:

I am all for helping any nation to feed its people and establish a democratic form of government, but Greece does not have a

democratic government. It has a feudalistic government, established at point of the British bayonets. Now it is proposed to back such a government as we have been backing reactionary governments all through the war years. If we were really sincere when we claim to want democracy and free government, we would long ago have helped poor Spain out of its present plight. We would not now, as we are, be a party to the tearing apart of Korea, and our munitions would not have been used in Java to keep the Javanese from their freedom.

Briefly, these are the reasons why I want to oppose with all my power this proposal:

It would make the United Nations organization worse than a scrap of paper; it would make our entrance into it a pure hypocrisy. With one hand we subscribe to it; with the other we play party politics.

It will align our country with reactionary governments in the eyes of the rest of the world. Our reputation for this is nothing to be proud of even before this proposal.

This means we are starting on the road of imperialism. The one and to my mind the only good reason for the past war is that imperialism was given a death blow. Now we propose to keep it alive a little longer.

This marks the beginning of an armament race between Russia and us that will bankrupt both.

It shows us the terrible consequences of leaving the military men to rule our Government.

It must lead inevitably and directly to war. Surely no sane person believes Russia will take such a blow lying down.

Let us send food to Greece and elsewhere to allay starvation. Let us back every decent democratic government that stands for freedom, but let us be done with any government that was established at the point of bayonets.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE GRECO-TURKISH AID PROPOSAL— "THE THIRD ROAD"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to speak on the subject of the Greco-Turkish aid bill. On March 12 President Truman addressed a joint session of Congress. His address was virtually a public declaration of political war on Russia. On that date the President proposed a radical and startling change in our traditional foreign policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations.

The consideration of Mr. Truman's proposal does not involve partisan politics. It is a question that concerns every American citizen regardless of political affiliation. The charge of imperialistic warmonger and starry-eyed internationalist will be made against those who support intervention as proposed by Mr. Truman. The charge of isolationist, anti-British, and pro-Russian will be made against those who oppose the Truman proposal.

There is a great body of American people who do not accept any of the hysterical labels I have named. There are in this Congress many Members who refuse to be classified under any of the labels noted. I am among that number. Neither blind party loyalty nor fear of labeling from either the extreme right or the extreme left can deter many of us from viewing with great concern this proposal. A proposal which seeks to change our traditional foreign policy in such an abrupt and drastic manner.

TWO FATEFUL ROADS

Mr. Truman's proposal involves the choice of only two roads, and they might be posted as follows: Nonintervention and intervention. Down the road of nonintervention we see the old mud hole of isolation, with its attendant danger of refusing again to accept our world responsibilities in a rapidly shrinking world. Down the second road, which is posted intervention, we see the dangerous quicksands of imperialistic, unilateral procedures which have preceded every war. Before we make our choice between the two roads which stretch so fatefully before us we want to be sure there is not a third and more desirable road as yet undisclosed by our leaders. Maybe there is a third road which we can find, and maybe that road is named United Nations Way. I will return to this alternative road later.

There are many questions to be asked, and there must be many satisfactory answers given, before some of us can choose either the first road—nonintervention—which beckons the traditional isolationists, the Communists, the pro-Russian fellow travelers, as well as the timid group who draw back from world responsibilities, or before we can choose the second road of unconditional intervention, which lures the twentieth century American imperialists, the hate Russia warmonger, and the confused group who do not realize the meaning of the Truman proposal.

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN QUESTIONS ON AID PROPOSAL

On March 20, 1947, a letter was addressed to the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, by a highly respected Member of the other body. Appended to this letter was a questionnaire containing 110 important questions relating to the Greco-Turkish aid proposal. I have read the 110 questions. Satisfactory answers may be available, but I have not to this day been furnished with a full list of answers. Not being on the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, I have not had the benefit of hearing the testimony presented, neither have I read the testimony presented in the similar committee in the other body. I have only this to say, unless satisfactory answers are given, many of us who refuse to be classified as isolationists or labeled as Communists will not vote for the bill. I do not intend to take up these 110 questions in detail. Time on the floor and space in the RECORD would forbid. I do intend to advance a few important questions however and make a few observations. The first question which concerns most of us is the basic one of Why has the United Nations been bypassed? Regardless of the belated excuses and explanations by those who wholeheartedly indorsed the Truman proposal, the fact remains that the original proposal was belligerent in its tone, filled with hot generalities, and fraught with most startling and dangerous implications. It was as dangerous from the standpoint of what it left unsaid as it was for the things it said.

WHY HAS THE UNITED NATIONS BEEN BYPASSED?

The furor of public alarm and opposition to the President's approach to this problem is now forcing tardy explanations, ameliorating excuses, and sycophantic references to "a stopgap emergency program pending United Nations action." Which is, to say the least, suspicious. It betrays a policy of second guessing, which strives to cover up the initial mistake. That the original joint message to Congress justifies the question, "Why has the United Nations been bypassed?" cannot be denied. The reaction from every thoughtful person was immediate and shocking, when they realized that the United Nations was practically ignored. People from every walk of life began to wonder if the United Nations was being classified as a futile and functionless shadow. A careful reading of the part of the President's message which summarily dismisses the United Nations as being too slow and ineffective to merit more than a passing bow, or a careless backhand slap, brought consternation and alarm to many thoughtful people. The harm done throughout the world in crushing the feeble flame of hope which exists in the heart of many war-weary people was incalculable. We realize that the United Nations has not been brought to fruition; we know that many parts of the outline are yet to be filled. We will concede that there is no international police force which can be sent into Greece to maintain civil order in the emergency. We will concede that it might be difficult to aid Greece in a monetary way without special multilateral action such as obtained in the establishment of UNRRA. We will concede that a Russian veto might prevent a unanimous edict of policy by the Security Council delegates. All these concessions we are willing to admit, and they do present great difficulties to prevent emergency action by the United Nations in this hour of crisis.

But because they present great difficulties shall we use these arguments as an excuse for killing the United Nations in its infancy? Shall we use the element of short time between the President's proposal on March 12 and the British evacuation on March 31 as an excuse for weakening an organization which holds the hope of millions throughout the world, the hope of millions who pray for the obtaining of world peace?

Or should this Greco-Turkish problem have been used as an opportunity for revitalizing and developing the United Nations in the direction of its original goal; that is, the formation of a vital, functioning, world organization for the solution of international problems and the assurance of world peace?

WHY SUCH UNSEEMLY HASTE?

Let us consider some pertinent factors involved in the proposal. First, the appeal to act hastily on the grounds of the emergency conditions which would ensue immediately after the abrupt withdrawal of British troops on March 31. I would like to know why the British are being allowed to precipitate such an abrupt crisis. Is it not true that our State Department has known for many

months that such action was contemplated? If so, why was the proposed British withdrawal not publicized so that Congress would have an adequate period of time to study and debate the subject of American intervention? If the British notice of withdrawal was necessarily as sudden as we have been led to believe, I would like to know if our State Department protested the abrupt action, and whether they requested the British Government to postpone for 60 or 90 days their withdrawal. This would have been a reasonable request and within the possible bonds of British compliance. It would have given us time to explore multilateral action. Laying aside for a moment the ethical question of the subject of intervention, and assuming that external political, economic, and military aid is necessary for the welfare and protection of the Greek people, assuming also that the United Nations has not been developed to the point where it can function in the Greco-Turkish crisis, we are still confronted with this question, "Is there no alternative to unilateral action of the United States?" The Truman proposal in effect says "No." But many of us are not satisfied with this answer. We do not believe that it is impossible to develop an alternative procedure. A procedure which would not duplicate the unilateral imperialistic solutions which have been the basis of all previous wars. We believe that a procedure could have been and still can be developed which will have the moral and spiritual force of multilateral sanction. A procedure which will comply with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the proposed goal of the United Nations.

IS THERE AN OVER-ALL FOREIGN POLICY?

Another very important question which I would like to ask is this, Do we have an over-all European, Middle East, and far eastern foreign policy? The reason I ask this question is obvious. The necessity of considering the Greek problem as part of an over-all European, Middle East, and far eastern problem is so plain that even a fool can see it. The solution of any of the various problems in these areas depends upon its relation to the other problems involved in adjoining areas.

Setting up a new procedure, a unilateral procedure on our part toward Greece, does two very important things: First, it ignores multilateral procedure as envisaged by the United Nations; and, second, it sets a precedent of unilateral procedure for not only ourselves, but for every other nation in the world. Once we embark upon this course of unilateral solution of international problems, we have no reason to criticize other nations for doing the same thing. That is why this proposal assumes an importance far beyond the scope of the Greek-Turkish aid proposal.

Our policy of piecemeal, spur-of-the-moment development of foreign policy, without regard to an over-all policy, has proven time and again to be a mistake. In this particular case—the Greek case—we know that the question of internationalization of the Dardanelles is involved, or at least Russian demands for egress and ingress to and from a

warm-water port in the Baltic. We know that this is the reason the Turkish military loan is tacked onto the Greek loan. It is to strengthen Turkey in her opposition to Russian demands. The excuse of starvation and maintenance of a quasi monarchist-democratic government, which clothes our Greek intervention with an aura of humanitarianism, has not been advanced to justify the Turkish portion of the appropriation. The reason it has not been advanced is because it is palpably untenable. Turkey is not starving, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be classified as even semidemocratic.

WHOSE CHESTNUTS ARE AT STAKE?

Another related problem, of course, is the oil problem. I say "related," but what I mean is it is one of our most important reasons behind our sudden interest in the Mediterranean. Now, lest

some of my anti-British friends say, "We are pulling English chestnuts out of the fire," let me make it very clear that in Iran, Iraq, and in Saudi Arabia, there are other chestnuts besides British chestnuts.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point two tables of statistics, which show whose chestnuts are in the fire.

Table No. 1 shows the daily oil production and the estimated oil reserves in barrel units of the Persian Middle East countries.

It also shows that not only the British chestnuts, but American, Dutch, and French chestnuts are in the fire.

Table No. 2 shows the names of the petroleum-developing companies and their ownership, by nationalities, and the respective percentages of ownership involved.

Britain and give it the importance it deserves in the development of an over-all, Middle East foreign policy?

If we are going to embark on an over-all Middle East policy, why not include along with the Greek problem the internationalization of the Dardanelles, the equitable division of concessions in the Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia oil fields? Also, why not include in the over-all discussion a solution of the Palestine question? There are other problems in the Middle East, but these three that I have mentioned are pressing enough and are related enough to demonstrate the fact that I first stated, that you cannot solve the Greek problem without taking into consideration other related problems in the Middle East.

MULTILATERAL SOLUTIONS IMPERATIVE

If we are to embark on a world-leadership program, as befits our position among the society of nations, let us be careful to exercise that leadership to give strength and being to the United Nations. We want to exercise that leadership in the full light of United Nations debate. We want to know when we embark on this venture of world leadership that we have the moral and spiritual force of at least the majority of the United Nations behind us. We do not wish to be in the vulnerable position of using our resources in an imperialistic way. We either move forward in the world of tomorrow, in concert with other nations toward multilateral solutions, or we move backward alone to the unilateral fiascos of the past.

THE RUSSIAN VETO

We have been told that one of the reasons why this matter has not been referred to the United Nations has been because of the certainty of a Russian veto. We want to discuss this point for the moment on the assumption that this prediction of a Russian veto is correct. First, let us remember that the veto provision in the Charter is not wholly chargeable to Russia. The United States was equally insistent that this veto provision be included. So in our criticism of Russia, for the misuse of the veto, let us not forget that she uses the tool which we helped to make.

The veto has been used 12 times by members of the Security Council. It was used twice by the United States and the United Kingdom voting in unison. It was used once by France and Russia voting together and it was used nine times by Russia alone. Many of us have come to the conclusion that the United Nations cannot be effective as a world organization if the nations comprising the "big five" retain the veto power. Let me point out, however, that we are probably no more ready to renounce the veto than Russia. If we find, however, that important international problems cannot be solved on the basis of complete unanimity, we must admit the futility of depending on the United Nations as now constituted to guarantee or facilitate world peace.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

What is the alternative? Referring specifically to the Greek problem, I notice that the morning papers report that a distinguished member of the other body

TABLE 1.—Petroleum production and reserves of Persian Gulf countries by nationality of corporate ownership

[U. S. 42-gallon barrels]

	Daily production ¹			Reserves ²		
	United States	British-Dutch	French	United States	British-Dutch	French
Iran.....		420,000			6,500,000,000	
Iraq.....	24,000	48,000	24,000	1,200,000,000	2,400,000,000	1,200,000,000
Qatar.....				250,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000
Kuwait.....	20,000	20,000		4,500,000,000	4,500,000,000	
Saudi Arabia.....	200,000			5,000,000,000		
Bahrain.....	20,000			300,000,000		
Total.....	264,000	488,000	24,000	11,250,000,000	13,900,000,000	1,450,000,000

¹ Oil and Gas Journal, Dec. 28, 1946, p. 175.

² American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, S. Res. 36, 79th Cong., p. 73.

TABLE 2.—Middle East oil companies—ownership by countries, 1947

[Information supplied by U. S. Department of State]

Country	Company	Ownership by nationality
Bahrain.....	Bahrain Petroleum Co., Ltd.	100 percent American owned—50 percent Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent Texas Co.
Iran.....	Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd.	100 percent British owned.
Iraq.....	Iraq Petroleum Co., Ltd.	23.75 percent American owned—Near-East Development Corp., in which Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. share equally.
Do.....	do.	23.75 percent French owned—Compagnie Francaise des Petroles.
Do.....	do.	23.75 percent Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd., British owned.
Do.....	do.	23.75 percent Dutch owned—Royal Dutch Shell.
Do.....	do.	0.5 percent owned by "individuals."
Qawait.....	Qawait Oil Co., Ltd.	50 percent American owned—Gulf Oil Co.
Saudi Arabia.....	Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco).	100 percent American owned—50 percent Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent Texas Co. A deal is pending for Standard Oil of New Jersey to buy 30 percent and for Socony Oil Co. to buy 10 percent of these holdings.

I cannot develop at this time the true significance of these tables of statistics, but I am sure that there is enough information presented in these tables to adequately lay the ghost of "British chestnuts" only.

Let us be frank and admit that the Turkish portion of the loan has two great reasons behind it. First, preservation of the status quo in regard to the Dardanelles, and second, the protection of American, Dutch, French, and British chestnuts in the oil deposits of the Middle East. The subject of oil, therefore, cannot be divorced from our consideration of the Greek-Turkish aid bill and we should openly acknowledge its involvement.

PALESTINE, A RELATED PROBLEM

And then there is another great question which has been before the American people for many years, and that is

the Palestine question, a question which involves the life or death of millions of people of Jewish ancestry throughout the world. The Palestine question has been explored on this floor too many times for me to go into detail at this time. But suffice it to say that Britain is maintaining in Palestine, we are informed, 100,000 troops. Many of us believe that the British handling of the Palestine question has been wrong. We believe that she has violated the Balfour agreement, and that her handling of Palestine as a League of Nations mandate has not been just or fair. Our President has asked for certain concessions from the British Government in opening the gates of Palestine to the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons in Europe. This request has not been granted. Would it not be possible to include this part of the Middle East problem in negotiations with

proposes to offer amendments which will in effect give supervisory powers over our proposed venture to a procedural vote of the Security Council—not subject to veto—or a majority vote of the General Assembly delegates. This proposal, in my opinion, is a very important move toward multilateral approval. A substitute joint resolution has been offered in the House by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. While I am not 100 percent in accord with this proposal, I do believe that it is worthy of very serious study as the main theme of the resolution points away from unilateral action and in the direction of multilateral action.

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL ALLIANCES

Addressing myself to the general problem of international organization, I would suggest that we encourage the formation of an adequate number of regional alliances consisting of as many nations as possible in each area who would be willing to work together on the principles of the United Nations. We have already done this in the Western Hemisphere and it has been approved as consistent with the world organization. The great advantage of the regional alliance would be that action could be taken on a policy or procedure without the paralyzing requirement of unanimity.

It may be necessary for the nations to learn to work together on a regional basis before we can function on the world level. We must admit that human nature has not yet attained that peak of perfection where unanimity is commonly achieved. Those functions of the world organization which are possible, and there are many, should still be encouraged and maintained. Many of these international subdivisions of the United Nations are making remarkable progress, without the participation of the U. S. S. R. I speak of the trusteeship council, the provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Every possible effort should be made to develop multilateral solutions as international problems arise, first on the regional basis and then on the world level. The principle of collective action must be maintained and unilateral action, such as the Truman proposal, avoided as we would avoid the plague. Like the bubonic plague, it is a virulent and contagious disease and a single case can start an epidemic that means certain death to the United Nations.

There is still time to return to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

In the first part of my speech, I described the choice between the two fateful roads of "nonintervention" and "unconditional intervention." I described the dangers attending the choice of either. I also suggested that there might be a third road which I called the United Nations way.

THE THIRD ROAD: "THE UNITED NATIONS WAY"

I believe that that third road is opening up before us. I believe that it can be developed and safeguarded by legislative conditions in the appropriation bills

and public commitments on the part of the President, the Secretary of State, and the United Nations delegate. To our delegate on the United Nations, the former distinguished Senator from Vermont, the Honorable Warren Austin, we owe a great debt of gratitude for pointing out the third road, "the United Nations way." The echoes of Mr. Truman's speech of March 12 had hardly ceased before the tide of public criticism began to mount, throughout the length and breadth of the United States. The people who had sacrificed so much in the great war just concluded, the people who saw the League of Nations scuttled after the First World War, the people who had pinned their faith to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations had asked again and again the question, "Why has the United Nations been bypassed?" Our delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Warren Austin, went before the United Nations Assembly on March 28 and said the things which the President should have said on March 12. Mr. Austin answered some of the important questions which have been troubling us, where Mr. Truman's proposal of intervention was based on one aim of the United Nations, that is, to prevent aggression against a weaker nation. It indicated that our action would be taken on a national basis, depending solely on our own strength and judgment. Mr. Austin's statement to the United Nations put the United States action on a very different basis indeed. Admitting that the United Nations was not ready, he made it clear that our intervention would be in line with the international principles of the United Nations, and that we welcomed the support of the other nations, both morally and financially. He admitted that the United Nations, as presently constituted, was lacking in financial resources. He pledged that our financial aid was on a temporary basis, pending the functioning of the United Nations on a long range basis through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He further advised the Greek Government to apply for a loan of at least \$100,000,000 from this source. He promised that our temporary aid would be administered along the lines recommended by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, an international commission which has just completed a very fine survey of Grecian needs.

Mr. Austin pointed out that a United Nations commission is at the present time investigating territorial invasions by armed bands on the northern border of Greece. He asked that special efforts be made to expedite their report to the Security Council. And certainly, by implication, he pledged our support in their recommendation.

We see then that belatedly we are harmonizing our plans with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

CONDITIONAL CLAUSES AND PUBLIC COMMITMENTS

All of the questions have not yet been answered; we hope they can be answered in a satisfactory manner. The conditional clauses have not been enacted into legislation. We hope they can be enacted. The public commitments and as-

surances from our President and the Secretary of State have not been made. We sincerely trust and hope they will be forthcoming. Unless these conditional clauses can be written into the bill and unless proper collaboration on a multilateral basis can be developed, many of us cannot vote for the bill. Vigilance on the part of every patriotic person will be required to mobilize an enlightened public opinion to point the way down the third road indicated. An enlightened public opinion which will demand that this crisis be handled the "United Nations way."

It may be the deciding factor in the life of the world organization we call the United Nations. It may mean the difference between world peace and world destruction in this atomic age.

If we save the United Nations, it will be because the common people demand that our leaders walk down the third road, "the United Nations way."

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two tables of statistics.)

SPECIAL ORDER

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here from a gentleman whom all of you know. I am not at liberty to reveal his name because I would like to talk to him before I do. But it is of little moment as to who he is. It is what he says that is important. I would like to read a few excerpts from his letter:

Byron wrote when he made his spectacular entry into Greece to help the Greeks throw off the yoke of the wretched Turks. The first four lines go like this:

"If a man has no freedom to fight for at home
Let him battle for that of his neighbors,
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,
And be knocked on the head for his labors."

Then the English were fighting against the infidel Turks. Now we are called on to fight for them. We have been denounced for not getting into the Spanish War on the side of the Communists, and are told if we had done so it would have stopped Hitler and prevented World War II. Now we must go into Greece against the Communists to stop Stalin and prevent World War III.

Meanwhile the poor American taxpayer has no freedom of choice and no money. He must not have a penny cut off his taxes or a penny in debt reduction lest this should threaten the security of his country. But it is all right to pour uncounted billions into the rat holes of the whole earth.

This Greece-Turkey thing is exactly like the token force in World War I and the 50 over-age destroyers in World War II. I hate to agree with LaGuardia on any issue, but his testimony yesterday was 100 percent right. If we go into this Greek thing we shall be pouring in money and the blood of our sons for generations. This is a turning point in the history of our country.

No matter who may have said that, whether a lowly citizen or a man of high position, those statements, and especially that poem, are most timely.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. RAMEY. The question that is before the Congress is not the question of who is right but what is right.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct, and I think the gentleman who wrote this letter and who recited this poem from Byron hit the nail on the head—I wish I had the entire poem—let me read it again:

If a man has no freedom to fight for at home,
Let him battle for that of his neighbors.
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,
And be knocked on the head for his labors.

Recently I had dinner with a young man who had just returned from the Philippines, a boy who was a draftee after the war. He said that we Americans are thoroughly despised. At least, the boys get that vibration from the Filipinos they met when they were serving in that country. Apparently, our role here is to be generous and kind and loving and considerate, and then we get knocked on the head for all of our good deeds. I think we ought to do some pretty good thinking about how we become involved in this Greek deal at this stage of the game.

A member of the other body—I am not supposed to mention his name because it would violate the rules of the House—said this matter should be referred to the United Nations, after we act on it here. I do not know just what the maneuvers are, but in any event, since we have a United Nations we ought to use it or else get out. The United Nations was most effective in the Iran controversy and even though Russia objected for a while, she yielded and went along with the program. I think it is entirely in order that this matter be considered by the United Nations and that we have no legislation here at all.

I believe the people of the world and the people of this country are sick unto death of government by emergency. We have had emergencies for 14 years, one after another. It is a sleight-of-hand performance under which you do not know what in the world you are doing except that you are following the path of least resistance.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. BREHM. If we would stop financing the various countries throughout the world they would come to an end immediately.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BREHM. The materials that are now being used are lend-lease and UNRRA materials. I maintain that there could not be another world war unless the American people financed it. If we would stop financing these conflicts it would do more to stimulate peace than anything I know of.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems

of small business the following Members of the House: Mr. FLOESER, of Missouri, chairman; Mr. STEVENSON, of Wisconsin; Mr. HOWELL, of Illinois; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. JACKSON, of Washington; and Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), until Thursday, April 3.

To Mr. WOODRUFF, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. ARENDT), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, indefinitely, on account of illness.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 169) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States has learned with profound sorrow of the death of His Majesty, George II, King of the Hellenes, and sympathizes with his people in the loss of their beloved King.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment of the House of Representatives to the Government of Greece.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of King George the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard to the consideration of the resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 31, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 146. An act to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

513. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the proposed deletion of part of the last paragraph in their letter of March 21, 1947, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report pursuant to Public Law 601 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) on investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 167. Resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to insure the funds of his office; without amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2339. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 603. A bill to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1099. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1584. A bill authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 341. A bill for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin; with amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 437. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; with amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim; with amendments (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; with amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; with amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Eva Bilobran; with amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Gilda Cowan; with amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; with amendment (Rept. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2389. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; with amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2900. A bill providing for a Public Welfare Act of 1947, to protect the common welfare and maintain the sovereignty of government in labor disputes vitally affecting the public welfare, public health, and public safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2901. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2902. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 2903. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by a veteran otherwise entitled to a pension by reason of a non-service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2904. A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act relating to fishermen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2905. A bill to amend section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2906. A bill to provide advice, counsel, and assistance from the Veterans' Administration to citizens of Mexico who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2907. A bill to amend the act of May 7, 1941 (ch. 87, 55 Stat. 177), and to provide for health and safety in coal mines affecting commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2908. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2909. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved November 21, 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 2910. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, including relatives of citizens or members of our armed forces, by permitting their admission into the United States in a number equivalent to a part of the total quota numbers unused during the war years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2911. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2912. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. Res. 168. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation with respect to the cost of living, strengthening our national economy, and preserving the free-enterprise system; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsement of the Hill-Taylor bill, which proposes the establishment of additional national cemeteries in each of the several States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 1770; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Noboru Shirai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Lucile L. Rice, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and James E. Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Andrew Weininger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfonsina M. Corradini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Long Caton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

297. The SPEAKER presented a petition of G. H. Wells, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to aid to Greece and Turkey, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who didst love us all so much that Thou didst send us Jesus Christ for the illumination of our darkness and the salvation of our souls, give us wisdom to profit by the words He spoke, faith to accept the salvation He offers, and grace to follow in His steps.

As Christ said: "When ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any," O God, give us grace now so to do.

As Christ said: "It is more blessed to give than to receive," O God, give us grace today to think, not of what we can get, but of what we can give.

As Christ said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged," O God, give us grace this day first to cast out the beam out of our own eyes before we regard the mote that is in our brothers' eyes.